





IRELAND
UNDER
ENGLISH RULE
OR
A PLEA FOR THE PLAINTIFF

BY
THOMAS ADDIS EMMET, M.D., LL.D.



VOLUME II.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press

1903

10:28

COPYRIGHT, 1903
BY
THOS. ADDIS EMMET

Published, September, 1903

50
12

205322

The Knickerbocker Press New York

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.	I
Early knowledge of the Irish people in the arts, manufactures and different industries—Noted ship-builders, navigators and merchants—All industries have been destroyed by England.	
CHAPTER II	21
Ireland prospered for a short time under her own Government—How this prosperity was destroyed.	
CHAPTER III	31
Ireland pauperized by illegal taxation since the "Union" with England.	
CHAPTER IV	49
The financial relation of Ireland and England.	
CHAPTER V	71
England's injustice to the Catholics of Ireland—Bigotry in opposition to a Catholic university.	
CHAPTER VI	85
The land question.	
CHAPTER VII	102
The poverty of the Irish people.	
CHAPTER VIII	112
The Land League movement and condition of the Irish tenant.	

	PAGE
CHAPTER IX	136
The Land League and the United Irish League.	
CHAPTER X	146
The aim of the United Irish League.	
CHAPTER XI	161
England and Ireland—What is to be accomplished by union of the Irish people.	
CHAPTER XII	176
England's difficulties create opportunities for improving Ireland's condition—Can she profit by them?	
APPENDIX	183
DIARY OF THOS. ADDIS EMMET	257
Residence of Thos. Addis Emmet on the Continent—His relations with Arthur O'Connor—Diary of his political action while in Paris, as the agent of the Irish leaders, to establish a republic in Ireland.	
INDEX	329

IRELAND UNDER ENGLISH RULE

IRELAND UNDER ENGLISH RULE

CHAPTER I

EARLY KNOWLEDGE OF THE IRISH PEOPLE IN THE ARTS,
MANUFACTURES AND DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES—NOTED
SHIP-BUILDERS, NAVIGATORS AND MERCHANTS—ALL
INDUSTRIES HAVE BEEN DESTROYED BY ENGLAND

WRITERS on Irish history have as a rule, from design or ignorance, ignored the fact that the Irish people excelled at an early period in manufactures, particularly of woollen, worsted and linen goods. They have also neglected to point out that judging from the specimens of bronze, iron, gold and silver work which have been preserved it is doubtful if, even with the aid of the cultivated taste of the present day, the workmanship could be equalled. The Irish were eminently an artistic people in other respects, as is shown amid the ruins of their cathedrals; and the work of their monks in illustrated manuscripts, from the earliest period to the introduction of printing, was never equalled in design and exquisite taste in the blending of colors. In common with other nations of the North the Irish excelled as navigators, were at one time expert ship-builders and carried on an extensive mercantile intercourse with Spain and the nations of the Mediterranean.

Stuart in his work¹ on the city of Armagh “for a period

¹ *Historical Memoirs of the City of Armagh*, etc., by James Stuart, A. B. Newny, 1819, pp. 144-147.

of 1373 years," describes the city as having been divided into four parts, the third of which was appropriated to the Saxons.

"This last place derived its name from the English merchants and students who inhabited that district of the city.¹ That such students flocked formerly to Ireland and frequented the schools or colleges of this kingdom, is beyond all question.²

"It is stated on the authority of Colgan, that Armagh was frequented not only by students from Great Britain, but also by English merchants. To some of my readers, this assertion may appear improbable, yet in a very remote period of antiquity, Ireland was well known to commercial nations. Tacitus says³ that 'the ports and landing places of Hibernia are better known than those of Britain, through the frequency of commerce and merchants.' Be this as it may, it is certain that manufactures of frizes and other woollen goods were carried on in Ireland, so early as the reign of Edward III. In the *Dittamondi* of Fazzio Delli Uberti, a Florentine poet, who wrote about the year 1357, the following passage occurs:

' Similmente passamo in Irlanda,
La qual fra noi e degna di fama
Per le nobile saie che ci manda.'

The translation of which: 'In the same manner we pass into Ireland, which among us is worthy of renown, for the excellent serges which she sends us.'

"This writer had visited Ireland and we have in the above passage a direct testimony that her serges were exported to Italy, where they were in high repute, as may be fairly inferred from the phrase, 'degena di fama.'

"Madox, Rymer, and the dictionary of *Della Crusa* maintain that manufactures of frize existed in Ireland even so far back as the thirteenth century, at a period when it was unknown in England.

"The author of *Della Crusa* quotes an ancient Florentine's

¹ *Tria Thaum*, p. 300.

² *Hist. Gent. Ang.*, i., 3, c. 25; i., c. 3, 4, *et passim*. Camden. S. Alcuin, in *veta Willeb.* See Appendix, No. v.

³ *Vita Agricola*, c. 24.

book of accounts, in which one of the items charged is for 'a piece of serge of Ireland for clothing the wife of Andrew.'¹

"In 1360 the weavers of Catalonia who manufactured serges of the finest sort, imitated those of Ireland and the belles of Florence wore the Irish serges as a fashionable dress."²

"Anderson in his treatise on commerce says that woollen clothes were made in Ireland in 1376.

"The manufacture of linen is also of considerable antiquity in Ireland. In a poem written A.D. 1430 by Hakluyt, a patriotic English traveller, there is a passage which proves that linen-cloth was at that period imported into Chester from Ireland:

'Hides and fish, salmon, hakes, herring,
Irish wool and linen cloth faldinge,
And marten's good be their merchandie,
Herte's hides and other of venerie.
Skins of otter, squirrel and Irish hare,
Of sheep, lamb and fox is her chaffare,
Fells of hides and conies great plenty, etc.'³

"Donat, who was a bishop of Fiesole in Italy, about the year 802, describes Ireland as 'dives vestis' rich in garments and clothing; and in the *Polychronicon* of Ran. Higden, an English writer who died in the year 1362, we find a passage to the same effect."⁴

"Thus it appears certain that at a very early period of time the people of Ireland were known as manufacturers of linen and woollen cloths.

"In the sixteenth century the people of Ireland seem to have possessed a superabundance of linen, of which they made a very extravagant use. At that period it was fashionable to wear shirts and chemises, each of which contained thirteen or fourteen yards of linen. An act of Parliament passed A.D., 1537, limited the quantity to seven yards for each smock or shirt, to be measured according to the King's standard.

¹ See *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. i., p. 18, a paper written by Lord Charlemont.

² Company's *History of Barcelona*, vol. i.

³ Hakluyt's *Principal Navigation Voyages*, edit. London, 1598. See also *Newby Magazine*, vol. ii., p. 92, for an able discussion on this subject.

⁴ *Polychron. Ranulph. Higdeni apud Gale*, pp. 179, 180.

“Notwithstanding this, Campion in 1571, says that the Irish then wore linen shirts ‘with wide hanging sleeves playted, thirty yards are little enough for one of them.’ In this year a law was passed which prohibited the export of linen cloth save by merchants free of boroughs or incorporate towns, etc.

“When we reflect on these matters, it is by no means improbable that English merchants may have resided in an inland part of the Kingdom, in order to purchase the manufactures of the country, on the cheapest and most advantageous terms.”

The affairs of Ireland can be traced by the Penal laws through the Statute Book of England, as a wounded man in a crowd could be tracked by his blood.

Could we blot out all record of England’s relations with Ireland during the past four hundred years and all vestige were lost but the laws enacted by the English Government to regulate the commerce and taxes of Ireland, her political history during this period could be easily and truthfully written from this financial standpoint.

The same animus of unmitigated selfishness on the part of England is apparent throughout in the actions of a power conscious of its strength in dealing with a despised and down-trodden people. In every law which has been enacted England’s gain has been the only incentive and this to the detriment of every interest in Ireland. At no time have the Irish people been treated as though they held any interests in common with or were individually members of the British Empire. They have been compelled to abandon every enterprise which, in any way, was calculated to compete with a similar interest already established in England. Ireland was not allowed to trade directly with any other nation but was forced to receive her supplies and necessities of life directly from Great Britain, so that the English people should alone be the recipients of all profits. In fact, the only conclusion which can be arrived at is that there has existed a determined purpose to hold the territory of Ireland simply as a vantage ground, without the slightest consideration for the majority of the people; and for centuries

no effort was spared, as we have shown, to exterminate if possible the Catholic portion of the population.

Beyond question a purpose existed similar to Russia's policy in Poland, namely, to pauperize the people and keep the country in the most unprosperous condition. This was done to strengthen the grasp of the Government upon the country and thus to prevent the people from helping themselves to gain their independence and to render their condition such that it offered no inducement for any foreign power to proffer aid.

Wentworth, Earl of Strafford and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1640, showed in a communication to Charles I. that such a policy existed at least at that time. It would however not be a difficult task to present circumstantial evidence to show that it has been a continuous policy, even to the present generation. Strafford wrote from Ireland¹:

“I am of opinion that all wisdom advises to keep this kingdom as much subordinate and dependent upon England as is possible, and holding them from the manufacture of wool; and then enforcing them to fetch their clothing from thence, and to take their salt from the King,—being that which preserves and gives value to all their native staple commodities—how can they depart from us without nakedness and beggary?”

The result has been that Ireland's chief staples of production and industry are potatoes and whiskey with more rags distributed among her people, as the finished product, than could be found in any other civilized country.

After Charles and Cromwell had nearly exterminated or driven into exile the Catholic portion of the Irish people, so that not less than five-sixths of the population of Ireland had either perished or emigrated and the remaining portion had been driven into the wilds of Connaught, Ireland became “settled” again, essentially, by a new people. The so-called Irish Parliament then existed and into the hands of these settlers the Government and development of the

¹ Strafford, *State Papers*.

country were placed. The question then presents itself: Why did the country, with such advantages and being in full sympathy with all the interests of the English people, not prosper afterwards? To the student of Irish history the reason of this failure is very apparent.

Newenham's¹ description of the situation in Ireland at the beginning of this century, is the one usually existing, under English influence:

"To cramp, obstruct, and render abortive the industry of the Irish, were the objects of the British trader. To gratify commercial avarice, to serve Britain at the expense of Ireland, or to facilitate the government of the latter, were the varying objects of the British minister. To keep down the *papists*, cost what it would, and to augment their own revenues by the public money, instead of urging the adoption of wise, liberal, and patriotic measures calculated to quadruple the rents of their estates, were the objects of the reputed representatives of the Irish people, and to secure themselves from retaliations on the part of the Roman Catholics, whom they were encouraged to persecute and taught to dread, was the general object of the Irish gentry."

The English Government has never relinquished the settled policy that Ireland should not prosper. The Irish Parliament was throughout simply a puppet, in which every wire was manipulated by the English Government. In fact for a long period no measure of any description could originate in that body but each had, first, to meet the approval of the authorities at Westminster before it could even be introduced into the Irish Parliament for consideration.

The first legislation against Irish productions seems to have been what is termed the "Statute of Kilkenny," which was adopted in 1367. One of the chief provisions of this bill was to diminish the agricultural products of Ireland.²

The "Parliament of the Pale," while in session at Drogheda in 1494, made a more determined and fully organized

¹ P. 97.

² This legislation was also intended to bring about a reformation in the manners and customs of "the degenerate English," as they were termed, the

effort to destroy Irish trade by the passage of "Poyning's Law," which was drawn up by Sir Edward Poyning, the Lord Deputy of Henry VII. The passage of this statute was the first step taken to deprive the Irish Parliament of all power, since it provided that no legislative act should pass that body until the title of each bill and the purpose thereof had been submitted to the English Privy Council and had also received the "royal sanction." In addition the Poyning Act prohibited any product of Irish industry being shipped from Ireland, on any vessel, without an English permit. This law compelled a vessel, loaded in any port of Ireland, to proceed to an English port for the purpose of obtaining a clearance or permission to make the voyage. Thereby, with the loss of time and the statutory fees exacted in addition, all profits on the venture were wiped out at the start and Ireland soon ceased to have a legitimate commerce. This caused the beginning of the smuggling, which was carried on by Ireland for centuries afterwards as her only source of profit.

Previous to this period, the Irish had been noted for being a most temperate race and the use of spirits was almost unknown. Some one has said, and probably with some exaggeration, that were it not for the too free use of whiskey Ireland would be a land of saints. Be this assertion true or not, it is perfectly natural that the Irish people should have resorted to stimulants, as the cheapest substitute for food, when they were in constant want. Therefore, if drunkenness is to be charged as one of the sins of the Irish people, it must at the same time be placed to the credit of English misrule in Ireland.

In time nearly every vessel in Ireland became a smuggler, taking out to some port in Spain or France Irish products in exchange for the luxuries and necessities required at home. Ireland to some extent again prospered in the

descendants of the early settlers who had intermarried with natives and adopted the Irish language and customs, while the Irish people themselves were ignored, as English laws were never applied to them.

occupation thus given to many and in consequence of her obtaining not only better but cheaper articles than those England had previously forced upon her. Naturally this condition of things developed a taste for luxurious living in many and caused the people at large to become improvident; a result perfectly in keeping with the circumstance under which their supplies were obtained; so when a reverse came the suffering of all was the greater. Very soon the English manufacturers, grown rich in the shoddy trade the Government had made for them in Ireland and having no longer a market, became exasperated and demanded relief.

In 1637, by what was termed the "Navigation Act," and again in 1660, 1663 and 1696, Parliament took action by the enactment of several penalties to prevent all intercourse with the Continent and the colonies. By this means England was again able to check all export trade from Ireland, thus leaving the Irish products without a market and the people without the means of purchasing the necessities of life even in the English market, the only one open to them.

The cattle trade between Ireland and England had been a prosperous one, though one only permitted in consequence of the necessities of England. But, by order of Cromwell to the English authorities, steps were taken to prohibit the shipping of cattle to England under the severest penalties. The cattle were then slaughtered in Ireland and, as salted meat, the carcasses were shipped to England. This importation was also promptly forbidden in 1680, including that of butter and cheese as well, and the prohibition was rigorously enforced until 1757, when the meat of Irish cattle was again admitted to England as a concession and for a limited time only, in consequence of a threatened English famine.¹ As

¹ At the present time cattle are exported from Ireland without restriction, as the English are unable to feed themselves, but the Irish people proper are not benefited. So large a portion of the country is now devoted to grazing purposes and employs comparatively so few individuals, that the mass of the people are unable to acquire the use of sufficient productive land for their support and many are yearly dying from starvation in a productive country. This subject we will consider later.

How the Leather Industry Developed 9

the Irish farmer could obtain but a limited home market for his meat, after the exportation had been prohibited, the cattle had to be slaughtered for the hides and tallow alone. Thus a very successful industry sprang up in the manufacturing of Irish leather which became known in the markets of the world as a very superior article. But the English Government promptly destroyed this industry by preventing all exportation of leather from the country.

According to Battersby ¹:

“Lord Sheffield said in 1775 that ‘Ireland could greatly extend her trade in the manufacture of leather, especially to America and the West Indies.’ He then considered the quantity exported considerable, when shoes to all parts of America and West Indies in 1783 alone amounted to £14,803, to Denmark and Norway £224, to Portugal £1436, to the Straits, £448.

	NUMBER
Tanned hides, same year exported, amounted to.....	10,488
Untanned hides.....	58,079
Calves' Skins (dozen).....	22,510

[Sheffield, p. 109].

Will the advocates of the Union shew us how these manufactures have increased since the Union in Ireland?”

According to Newenham ²:

“The wool of Ireland was remarkably fine. It far surpassed that of England. According to the evidence of Mr. Hone in 1784, as appears in the Irish Commons Journals, it sold about the beginning of the last century for two shillings the pound. Even now, notwithstanding the deterioration it has experienced, the wool of the native Irish sheep sells, in some parts of Ireland, for two or three shillings the stone more than the wool obtained from the English breed of sheep.”

Evidently the climate of Ireland improved the quality of the wool as the article found in the counties of Clare and Kerry at the present day from the native sheep is remarkably fine, notwithstanding that so long an interval has

¹ P. 187.

² P. 101.

elapsed since the woollen industry was an active one. The woollen manufacturers of Ireland, in the reign of William III., had obtained a world-wide reputation. This industry, in time, was destroyed by various Acts of Parliament prohibiting the exportation to any country and it then became a penal offence to shear a sheep or to sell a pound of wool in Ireland. The Irish farmer had first to send his sheep to certain ports of England, where the English officials were appointed to shear the sheep, and English officials fixed the price at which the wool was to be sold. This was only done "for a consideration" and when the farmer had paid his tax and the expense of transportation, there remained no profit to pay the English export duty in order to return to Ireland with either sheep or wool. Consequently the woollen industries of Ireland were at once wiped out because of the penalties enforced and the want of raw material. Any attempt to take out from Ireland wool or woollen goods, even in the smallest quantity, was prevented by confiscation of the ship, the goods and an additional penalty, as a fine, of five hundred pounds for each offence. Thus, it has been stated on good authority that, chiefly in Ulster, over forty thousand persons, nearly all of whom were Protestant, were suddenly reduced to pauperism by this one Act of Parliament and forced to emigrate, while thousands elsewhere who had been induced to settle in the country were beggared.

Plowden¹ quotes from a speech on Irish commerce made by the Hon. Luke Gardiner in Parliament, from which we have already taken some extracts. He states further:

"When William III. came to the throne of these Kingdoms, he laid several unjust and pernicious restrictions on the trade of Ireland, in order to gratify England, which began to grow jealous of our prosperity: in other respects he may have served this Kingdom; he may have been wise and good; but certainly these unjust and destructive restrictions, together with other penalties, manifested by him against us on all occasions, are more than a counterpoise to every good he has done this country. The first

¹ Vol. iii., Appendix, p. 41.

stab given in his reign to our rising trade was given in 1698, when a corrupt majority in this house laid a duty on Cloths exported to England. Some spirited and patriotic members standing up to oppose this measure, it was defended on the ground of being an experiment, and that it would continue for three years only, but it was in the year following made perpetual. Let us mark the consequences. The manufacturers, no longer able to find subsistence at home, emigrated, where they were received with open arms. The French, notwithstanding every exertion, had been unable to establish the woollen manufactures, until they procured Irish wool to mix with their own, and Irish men to weave it. They then, conscious of the advantages of protecting their trade, laid additional duties on the importation of English cloths. The event soon confirmed with what propriety they adopted these protective duties; they in a short time manufactured enough for the home market, and by raising from time to time the protective duties, at length to a prohibition, are enabled not only to rival Great Britain, but to undersell her in every market in Europe."

We have already pointed out that by this emigration the greater portion of the so-called "Scotch-Irish" left Ulster and established in France woollen industries which to the present day have continued to be a constant detriment to English trade.

Barlow states¹:

"Deprived of the means of subsistence at home, thousands of Irish manufacturers emigrated to France and other countries, where they assisted the inhabitants in the augmentation of the quantity and improvements of the quality of their woollen cloths and established correspondents by which vast quantities of Irish wool, whose exportation, except to England was prohibited, were carried clandestinely to other countries.

"Thus the foreign demand for English cloth was prodigiously more lessened than it could have been by any exertions of Irish industry at home; the French were enabled not only to support their own demands, but even to undersell the English markets of

¹ Barlow's *Ireland*, p. 290.

other nations; and thus for every thousand pounds of profit which Ireland might have acquired by a participation with England in this trade, the latter has lost ten thousand."

This legislation was soon followed by other enactments to prohibit Irish merchants from using any ships but those built in England and no direct trade was permitted between the Irish people and any of the English Colonies. Thus the industry of ship-building which had become a prosperous one in Ireland was at once destroyed. By another law the only importation allowed to come into Ireland was rum from the Island of Jamaica. And this concession was evidently with the expectation that the cheaper article would eventually destroy the whiskey trade, the only industry at that time remaining in Ireland. For the greater part of the last century a most rigid protective tariff was enforced in England and, as far as possible, in Wales and Scotland, every clause of which was enacted for the sole purpose of destroying Irish trade and prosperity.

After the destruction of the woollen industries in Ireland, during the reign of William III., the Irish people turned their attention to the manufacture of silk fabrics, which gained a repute never obtained by the English workmen. This degree of prosperity existed for over three-fourths of a century, notwithstanding that every obstacle was raised by the Government, and was not finally crushed out until English silk fabrics were admitted into Ireland free of all duty while the Irishmen were unable to export.

Newenham writes¹:

"At the time of passing the Act, which exempted from duty the silk manufacturers of Great Britain, there were according to the evidence given before the Irish Parliament in 1784, 800 silk looms at work in Ireland. Thirty-six years after there were but 50; and thus 3000 persons were driven to beggary or emigration. In consequence of the establishment of the silk warehouse, which seems as attributable to an anxiety to preclude the alarming dis-

¹ P. 119.

turbances which frequently happened among the starving silk manufacturers in Dublin, as to any other cause, 1528 broad silk looms, 1171 ribbon looms, and 79 engines were at one time employed; and supported 11,270 persons; the value of whose labor was computed to amount to 140,000 pounds a year. But the increased importation of silk manufactures from England had thrown out of employment 780 looms in 1783; and thus deprived 3120 persons of their usual means of support."

At one period the iron smelting industries were far more extensive in Ireland than in any other country and she was also a large exporter. Sir William Petty states that in 1672 there were 6600 furnaces in full blast, giving employment to 22,500 men and women in connection with the work and at that time at least 2000 persons were employed directly in the manufacturing. There exists no evidence that the iron supply of Ireland has been impaired and in some districts it is found unusually accessible. But the purpose of the English Government has been accomplished. With coal and iron ore to be found in close proximity, as is the case in some portions of the North, Ireland is obliged to-day to import what pig iron it needs, often at a loss, after shipping the ore to Great Britain to be smelted.

The wasteful destruction of valuable forests was encouraged by the Government to be used in producing the iron, on the plea that a hiding place for men and wild beasts was thus removed. After the timber had been thus to a great extent destroyed, no effort was made to revive the iron industries by the use of coal. As the coal in Ireland is generally found at a lower depth than in England it was probably thought from this circumstance there could be no competition with the English coal mines. Consequently, as an exception, there seems to have been placed no special restriction by the Government upon this development until after the Union, since which time it has been taxed. There has certainly been no encouragement offered to develop an industry which could be made profitable with but little assistance. As a curious circumstance, even if it be but a

coincidence, it may be mentioned that the whole railroad system of Ireland has in every quarter avoided the coal regions, as though a survey had been made for that purpose. So little coal is now mined in Ireland that the general impression exists that the mineral is not found in that country. Yet there is an almost inexhaustible supply as, according to the report made by Professor Hull in 1886, it is estimated that the coal deposits of Ireland cover an area of 61,440 English acres, with frequently a second seam of coal at some distance below the first. Should circumstances ever arise to lessen in Ireland the additional expense necessary for bringing the coal to the surface from a lower depth, the Irish mines, with iron deposits, could be made more profitable than the English mines alone.

The Irish oak had a world-wide reputation for use in ship-building. But to obliterate this industry in Ireland, which had never conflicted with English interests, England wilfully caused the finest oak forests in the world to be destroyed and then consummated her purpose, as already stated, by special legislation. Consequently, Ireland is to-day treeless in comparison with other countries.

In 1698 an attempt was made to prohibit all fish-taking on the Irish coast unless English boats were employed manned by Englishmen; and at a later date the Irish fishermen were not allowed by the English Government to fish on the banks of Newfoundland and thus compete, as it was claimed, with the English trade.

At the close of the nineteenth century and after an interval of two hundred years we find but little has been accomplished in the development of the Irish fisheries by which the people can derive any benefit. For a long period, as a grant from the English Government, a noble family derived its chief support from the sale of licenses to fish off the coast of Ireland. The writer is ignorant of the identity of the present recipient but this tax is yet too great for the people to bear, who from want of capital are unable to provide the proper boats, the nets and other outfit needed

for deeper sea fishing; while without a license a serious penalty, as of old, is exacted for taking fish within a certain distance of the coast. The writer has witnessed in the west of Ireland, at the mouth of a stream emptying into the Atlantic, the incoming of so great a shoal of salmon from the sea to spawn that along the banks many fish were crowded above the water surface and could be taken out with the hand. As this was daily witnessed by a crowd of unemployed, half-naked and famished people, the writer was surprised that advantage of the opportunity was not taken. In answer to his question he was informed that the pangs of hunger were preferable to the penalty. None of these people realized that they but showed a marked characteristic of the Irish people in their great respect for the law, however unjust, which unlike all other people they seldom violate but under the greatest provocation.¹

As an instance of the fatality which seems to insure the failure of every enterprise in Ireland with which the English Government has even the remotest connection, the following instance will be cited from a source believed by the writer to be reliable.

The little fishermen's village of Baltimore² on the southwest coast of Ireland, which gave his title to the first proprietor of Maryland in this country, has for many years been the scene of great destitution, even for Ireland. Notwithstanding that these people were sea-faring by nature, their poverty rendered them unable to provide the proper outfit for fishing on so stormy a coast. There seemed to be no relief until through some influence the Baroness Burdett-Couts was induced to advance a sufficient sum of money to supply all that was needed. The neighborhood soon began to prosper and the benefactress of these people

¹ The reader could refer with advantage to the testimony given on this point by Sir John Davis, the Attorney-General of Ireland, over three hundred years ago which was presented in the introductory chapter of this Work.

² From the Irish *Baile-tig-mor*,—the town of the big house; the land proprietor's residence.

was soon gratefully repaid every shilling she had advanced. This improved condition prompted the parish priest to attempt an enterprise which he had long intended for the establishment of an Industrial school for the sons of fishermen. The object was to give instruction in boat-building, net-making, the curing of fish, the art of cooperage and a knowledge of all other details connected with the fishing industry. The Rev. Charles Davis, with the aid of some influential people, finally so established the enterprise that these boys were able to produce the most expensive nets at half the market price and of better quality, while they attained the degree of proficiency in all other details to insure success. As such an industry could not be maintained indefinitely by private aid it was necessary to provide some regular means of support. To obtain this the managers of the Davis Industrial School applied to the Government for permission to receive a special grant from the county to be paid by the people who were benefited and to be based upon the number of boys who received instruction, as was provided for under other circumstances. The request was refused unless the special school was brought under the "Industrial School Act," which provides for "vagrants and boys who have been guilty of petty crimes," etc., and their commitment to these reformatories as criminals held under restraint. No remonstrance or explanation was successful in changing this mandate of the Government and, as these poor people naturally refused to permit their boys to accept the incalculable advantages offered with this stigma placed upon them, the enterprise has failed or has accomplished little. This is as the Government authorities intended, that it should not continue a success, since no English interest was benefited.

Before the close of the seventeenth century Ireland had demonstrated the value of her glass works, whose production was universally accepted as the most beautiful to be obtained anywhere. This was due to the superior quality of certain sands deposited in different parts of the country,

peculiarly adapted to the purpose, and to her remarkable richness in the necessary salts found in the ash obtained from the Irish kelp grown on the West coast. No other nation has been able to attain so high a standard in this article as the Irish have. The enmity of the English manufacturers was thus excited and the British Parliament in the nineteenth year of the reign of George II. prohibited the importation into Ireland of glass from any other country than from England and its export from Ireland to any country whatsoever. In addition, the penalty was forfeiture of the ship and cargo, with a fine of ten shillings for every pound of glassware put on board. Yet it was nearly one hundred years later before England was able totally to destroy this industry and she is to-day dependent on the use of the Irish kelp for the success of her own glass manufactories.

The beer, ale, and porter brewing industries of Ireland were at one time so prosperous that Parliament, during the reign of George II., directed that all hops landed in Ireland, but those imported direct from England, should be burned and that on the English hops the Irish people should pay an import tax of threepence per pound. The consequence was the one anticipated and Ireland soon became dependent on the English article for her supply; with the loss of all capital in addition.

The injustice of England, and even the brutal spirit on her part of inflicting injury, is clearly shown in the following example from Newenham's work¹:

“Under the paralysing influence of the mercantile spirit, the legislature of Britain really treated the people of Ireland, unprotected as they were by an independent Parliament, or rather wantonly and treacherously exposed to ill treatment by a dependent and mercenary one, much worse than that legislature did, or could have treated the people of any of those countries with which, in the vicissitudes of politics, it might frequently be engaged in war.

¹ Pp. 106-108.

In other words, it imprudently injured those who were destined to second it in its wars, much more than those who were likely to become its antagonists. The measures already noticed show the truth of these assertions. The following schedule of duties will confirm them:

1784. (All fractions have been omitted.)

DUTIES PAYABLE IN GREAT BRITAIN ON THE IMPORTATION OF THE FOLLOWING GOODS—NOT FRENCH	DUTIES IN IRELAND ON BRITISH GOODS IMPORTED
£ S. D.	£ S. D.
All manner of woollen cloths by the yard.....	Old Drapery.....
2 0 6	5
Stuff made or mixed with wool, ditto.....	New ditto.....
5 11	1
Sugar refined, the cwt....
5 6 9	1 13 11
Beer and Ale, the barrel, 32 gallons
1 5	1 2
And besides, if valued at 20s. per barrel.....
5 11	2 3
Spirits, single—not of Brit- ish plantation—per gallon
3 0	9 18 5
Cotton manufactures, un- rated, not brought from the East Indies, for every £100 on oath
29 15 10	9 18 5
And besides, for every £100 value, gross price at the candle.....
17 17 6	3 11
Linen and cotton mixed, for over £100 value on oath	every £100 value on oath..
29 15 10	9 18 5
Linen cloth, white or brown, Irish free. Ditto, printed, etc., for every £100 value on oath....lb.
65 10 10	7 5
Silk stockings prohibited.....
12 6	1 0 8
Stockings, cotton or thread, the dozen pair...
17 17 6	9 18 5
And besides, if cotton, for every £100 gross price at the candle.....	dozen pair.....
17 17 6	2 11
Wrought silks prohibited.....	every £100 value on oath..
6 8 8	9 18 5
Hops, the cwt.....
6 8 8	9 18 5
Leather, manufactures un- rated, for every £100 value on oath.....
65 10 10	9 18 5
Gloves of silk or leather prohibited
4 10	9 18 5
Chip hats, the dozen, medium, between large and small.....

DUTIES PAYABLE IN GREAT BRITAIN ON THE IMPORTATION OF THE FOLLOWING GOODS—NOT FRENCH			DUTIES IN IRELAND ON BRITISH GOODS IMPORTED		
	£	S. D.		£	S. D.
Candles of tallow, the cwt.	1	9 8	5	6
Starch, ditto.....	4	12 1	6	5
Soap, ditto.....	2	7 8	5	11
Checks, the piece, not above 10 yards.....	3	11	1	3
And besides, for every £100 value on oath	35	15 0			
Bed-ticks, not rated, for every £100 value on oath	29	15 10	9	15 8 ¹

“The heavy duties in the first column, imposed by the British Parliament, placed Ireland on a level with other unfavoured countries; the moderate ones on the second, imposed by the complaisant Parliament of Ireland, gave an advantage in the Irish market to the English manufactures, which they of all others, least deserved. . . . The gloves, the tabbinets, and the silk handkerchiefs of Ireland, all of which might have become valuable manufactures, were selfishly excluded from the British market; and yet they have never since been equalled in Britain. This was pushing commercial envy to a most inexcusable, extravagant and unprofitable length.”

From this schedule the reader will be able to judge of the discriminating tariff enforced by England up to 1784, before which time Ireland was not allowed to import or export from or to any other country but England. It requires no commercial training fully to understand the meaning and purport of every figure in this schedule.

Adam Smith, in his work *Wealth of Nations*, has stated:

“To prohibit a great nation from making all that they can of their own produce, or from employing their stock and industry in the way that they judge most advantageous to themselves, is a manifest violation of the most sacred rights of mankind.”

Newenham writes²:

¹ Irish Money. *Journals of the House of Commons*, vol. ii., p. 140, Appendix.

² P. 159.

“Such was the prevalence of that spirit of commercial jealousy which operated in Britain, such its influence on the decision of the legislature, and so little guided were the statesmen of Britain by the just and liberal notions of commerce, and of the true interests of their sovereign’s dominions, that the statute-book of that country, containing many acts hostile to the trade and manufactures of Ireland, presents not a single one from the Revolution, to the date of Irish independence, calculated to promote its trade, except those few which appear to have owed their origin to downright necessity; and which, therefore, cannot evidently be considered as boons by the people of Ireland.”

CHAPTER II

IRELAND PROSPERED FOR A SHORT TIME UNDER HER OWN GOVERNMENT—HOW THIS PROSPERITY WAS DESTROYED

AT the close of the Revolutionary War for independence in this country, England was exhausted in all her resources and was obliged to grant to Ireland in 1782 Home Rule in consequence of the "Volunteer Movement."

Barrington after describing the action of the British Government and its full acknowledgment of Ireland's legislative independence, writes ¹:

"From that day Ireland rose in wealth, in trade, and in manufactures, agriculture, and every branch of industry that could enhance her value or render a people rich and prosperous. . . . The court of her Viceroy appeared as splendid as her monarch's. Her nobles resided and expended their great fortunes amongst the Irish people, the Commons all resided on their own demesnes, supported and fostered a laborious and tranquil tenantry. The peace of the country was perfect, no standing army, no militia, no police were wanting for its preservation, the activity of the Volunteers had suppressed crime in every district, religious prejudices were gradually diminishing; every means of amelioration were in contemplation or progress. The distinctness of Ireland had been proclaimed to the world by overt acts of herself, and of her monarch, and the King of England. The Irish scepter in the hands of her King had touched the charter of her independence, on the faith of nations, before God and man its eternal freedom had been declared, and should have been inviolable.

¹ *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*, p. 330.

But to some inscrutable will of heaven, it was decreed that she should soon again be erased from the list of nations, punished without a crime, and laid prostrate at the feet of a jealous ally."

At that time only about one-eighth of the population of Ireland, or those who conformed to the established Church, could take any part in the management of Irish affairs. Yet, under the Grattan Parliament as it was termed, Ireland began immediately to teem with prosperity and her development was a marvel to the world. Within three years after Irish affairs had been taken from under English influence Secretary John Foster, in reference to Ireland's commercial relations with England, stated that :

" Britain imports annually two million five hundred pounds of our products all, or nearly all, duty free, and we import a million of hers and raise a revenue on almost every article of it."

John Fitzgibbon, as Earl of Clare, a man who in his day was despised by every honest man in Ireland and who fully reciprocated this feeling by his hatred of all who were not friendly to him, made the following statement in his noted speech of 1798, which is the more valuable testimony as he certainly would not have exaggerated the favorable condition of the country he was about to sell :

" There is not *a nation on the face of the habitable globe* which has advanced in *cultivation, in agriculture, in manufactures*, with the same rapidity, in the same period " (that of legislative independence) " as Ireland."

It was this unprecedented prosperity which stimulated the Earl of Clare to bring about the "Union" between Ireland and England in order to destroy the former. And, Judas-like, he committed suicide from remorse.

This degree of prosperity alarmed the English Government to such an extent that, as England regained her strength, she at once set about rescinding the concessions already

made. The troubles of 1798 were the result, for the people of Ireland were forced to open resistance as an inevitable consequence of the deliberate purpose of the English Government.

The proclamation in 1800 of England's triumph in effecting the so-termed Union was the death-knell of Ireland's future prosperity. In this close relation, brought about by main force, there was as much hope for Ireland to regain her vitality as there would be for an exhausted individual whose life-blood was being crushed out in the embrace of a grizzly bear from our own Rocky Mountains. A comparison of the degree of sympathy or solicitude on the part of England, for the future of her victim, merely carries the simile further.

A pall rested upon Dublin, the capital of the nation, and the city became deserted. Property ceased to retain its value, the nobility and gentry, including landlords, fled from the country whenever it was possible to do so and their absence from that time on has been an unceasing drain upon the resources of the country. Battersby shows that the sum sent from Ireland to the absentees after the "Union" and up to the time of publication of his Work was not less than four million of pounds per annum and no writer has shown that this amount has decreased to the present time. He thus tabulates the subject ¹:

"We have seen that the sum remitted to the Irish absentees before the Union was estimated at £2,223,222.

"If to this we add what twenty-eight sitting peers received whilst out of the country, say eight months in the year, at only £5000 each, p. a. £93,333.

"The sum spent by one hundred Commoners, averaged at £2000 per annum, for only six months, £100,000.

"Absentees since the Union (see their names in Stanton's Tracts, with others, not included in former lists) say only 300 at £5000 per annum, £1,500,000.

¹ *Repealer's Manual*.

"Five hundred petty absentees, not included in former list, say only £250 each, £125,000.

"This will make yearly at least, £4,041,555.

"If any man doubts our calculations, let him put down the rents of Ireland, remitted from each county, let him add to these the profit of offices, employments, pensions, appeals, journeys of pleasure or health, education at the universities, or inn's court, sums sent by bishops to their relatives in England and elsewhere—and he will be inclined to believe that nearly half the income of Ireland, is remitted to England or foreign parts."

The report of the Select Committee on Dublin Local Taxation in 1825, shows that in Dublin:

"Prior to the Union, 98 peers and a proportionate number of wealthy Commoners inhabited the city. The number of resident peers at present (1825) does not exceed 12."

Previous to 1800 Dublin was noted for the number of her literary writers and the city was known as a great book and music centre. Battersby states:

"Before the Union there was such an exportation of books from Ireland to America, that several establishments in Dublin scarcely did any other business. . . . We have now before us a catalogue of books published in Dublin before the Union. It contains 20,000 volumes in all languages and all sciences. Let any man read this list and see were there not more works printed in one year before the Union, than in 30 years since? . . . Before the Union, there were upwards of fifty respectable printing establishments in Dublin alone."

He also calls attention to the fact that no book printed in England was allowed to be exported from Ireland to America.

Mr. Ensor in his valuable work thus sketches the ruinous consequences of the "Union," on literature in Ireland, but particularly in the Irish metropolis¹:

¹*Ireland as She Ought to Be.*

" Dublin was to be especially advanced. The capital city was to become an Athenæum; yet it lost nearly all its printing business. No book is now published in Dublin,¹ which issued Encyclopedias, dictionaries, etc., and supplied the American market. Pamphlets have perished; for comparing these publications in England and Ireland it appears, that the duty on them in England for twenty years, amounted to £16,188.15.0—whilst in Ireland it did not exceed £154.17.4½. Everything connected with the latter declined; darkness overspread the land—even darkness that may be felt. . . . Even the sparks of intelligence were extinguished; for Ireland having lost her Parliament, the College of Dublin closed the minor senate, the Historical Society; and Locke on *Government* was displaced for Butler's *Analogy*. What a substitute! Nothing succeeded after the Union but ultra-orthodoxy (church ascendancy) and saintly tracts." ¹

It has been claimed that the silk fabrics, with tapestry and carpet industries were not equalled in quality elsewhere. During a debate on this subject in the Irish Parliament in 1784 it was stated that at that time there were fourteen hundred silk looms in operation in Dublin alone, giving employment to eleven thousand persons and the statement was made at a subsequent debate that six hundred and fifty thousand yards of Irish drapery from this source were exported the following year. There were no less than forty paper mills on the Liffey, in this industry. But she stole even the trade-mark by which this product of Irish skill was known. The cotton manufactories which, it has been shown, in 1780 gave employment to some thirty thousand persons were all eventually destroyed as well as the making of the celebrated Irish gloves; this, by emigration of Irish workmen, afterwards became an industry of Paris where to the present time it has proved most profitable.

Battersby states ²:

¹ Now, at the end of a century, this is not strictly true, as it is possible to get a book printed in Dublin; but beyond the publication of a few newspapers and pamphlets it is rarely that more is attempted.

² Pp. 194, 195.

“As the exportation of hats (says Sheffield) from Ireland exceeds the importation, it is clear that the manufacture of that article must be very considerable there. . . . In the year ending the 25th March, 1784, the exports (of hats) to America alone were 11,867. From what Lord Sheffield says, ‘It is likely that the exportation before the Union was at least 50,000.’ . . . It would not be too much to say that (in 1883) Ireland is deprived of £100,000 sent elsewhere for hats, which could be as well manufactured at home to the maintenance of 5000 individuals. In manufacturing silk plush alone, from 150 to 200 persons could be employed in Dublin.”

In reference to the soap trade, Battersby also makes the statement¹:

“Scarcely any trade has been more injured than this by the Union. According to the report published by Grierson, in 1800, the exports from Ireland ending the 25th of March, 1799 (the worst year) of candles, soap, etc., were to the amount of £71,220. Since the Union, the trade, so far as Ireland is concerned, has been nearly destroyed. Upwards of 100 per cent. has been added to the benefit of England and to the injury of Ireland; whilst if Ireland had fair play, she would have superseded the English market.”

In connection with the glass industry the manufacturing of earthenware was well developed and profitable in Ireland but it has become nearly extinct since the “Union.”

According to Battersby²:

“The flannel trade of Wicklow and Kilkenny and the serge trade of Limerick, which gave employment to an immense number of men and women, are also nearly destroyed. The woollen trade, which was much injured by English policy before the Union, met by that measure its final fate. Before that period thousands of the wives and daughters of the Irish farmers and cottiers were employed in the various branches of spinning wool for coarse clothes, blankets, flannels, serges, and stockings. How

¹ Pp. 194, 195,

² Pp. 183, 190.

many are employed now? . . . To show the value of the cotton manufacture of Ireland, it is only necessary (with Lord Sheffield) to bear in mind, that £200,000 purchased 2,000,000 lbs. weight of it, and that every pound wrought into stockings, fustians, dimities, muslins, velverets, etc. etc., produced on an average six shillings and eight pence value in manufactures, which was but a loss estimate, the amount being £666,666, 13 shillings, 4 pence, sterling, or £456,666, 13 shillings, 4 pence, national profit, whilst the merchant's profit, supposing only one half exported, will far overbalance the profits of the silk mercer."—Page 205.

Battersby quotes from Bardin (page 49) to show that before the "Union":

" 'The importation of cotton wool increased from 822,778 lbs. to 4,249,688, by which the wealth of the country increased upward of £1,000,000, a year and gave employment to nearly one hundred thousand people.' " Battersby also states: "Spencer, in his *Thoughts on the Union*, in 1798, said, p. 42, 'that the North of Ireland carried on a manufacture of linens, of which 52,000,000 yards had been exported in one year.' We would ask our cautious gentlemen in the North, do they now export the same quantity? "

Irish poplins and the linen manufactures of the North of Ireland were almost the last hope for the prosperity of the country. Yet England, after a compact to protect the linen industries of Ireland in return for a monopoly of woollen manufactures, which agreement with the Irish Parliament was ratified by both houses of the British Parliament during the reign of William, violated as usual her pledge, when no longer profitable to herself, by passing a high prohibitory tariff which so favored Holland and Germany that these countries were able to undersell the Irish manufacturers. Thus at least twenty thousand people were beggared notwithstanding that the greater portion of these were Protestants and in full sympathy with the English people. It was stated in Parliament that, if the Irish were allowed to export their linens and come in competition with the linen

manufacturers of Holland, *the Dutch would retaliate and refuse the woollen goods of England.*

The industries we have described had been already to a great extent destroyed when the "Union" was brought about but some were yet remaining. Fox wrote¹:

"Let us see what was the effect of Pitt's measure on manufactures. In 1800 there were in:

Dublin, 90 woollen manufacturers, employing 4918 hands.

Dublin, 30 wool-combers, employing 230 hands.

Dublin, 13 carpet-combers, employing 230 hands.

Dublin, 2500 silk-loom weavers.

Cork, 1000 braid weavers.

Cork, 2000 worsted weavers.

Cork, 3000 hosiers,

Cork, 700 wool-combers.

Cork, 2000 cotton weavers.

Cork, 600 linen-check weavers.

Wicklow, 1000 hand-loom weavers.

Kilkenny, 57 blanket manufacturers.

Balbriggan, 2500 calico looms at work.

To-day not a vestige of these industries remains, while of new works to take their place there are practically none."

After England had accomplished her purpose and had enriched her own manufacturers by crushing out every Irish industry and after she had well-nigh depopulated the country by forced emigration, famine and fever (all the direct consequences of the mismanagement of her trust and of her indifference to the best interest of Ireland) and after the greater portion of all the arable lands had been turned into cattle ranges—after this, be it noted, she became an advocate and supporter of free trade, forcing Ireland to conform to the same policy!

In answer to the flippant charge, so often made against the Irish people, that they themselves are responsible for the want of prosperity in their country, Mr. Emmet states as follows²:

P. 141.

² *Pieces of Irish History*, New York, 1807, p. 6.

“The assertion cannot be true of a country which, in itself protected by its insular situation, contains 19,000 square miles; which by being sacrificed to the aggrandisement of England, and turned into its best market, instead of its most formidable competitor, *has probably increased the capital and opulence of that Kingdom by almost one-third*; which, notwithstanding repeated wars, constant emigration, and the want of trade, manufactures, or agriculture, has been able to create and support a population of five millions; which furnishes to Europe some of her most distinguished officers, to the British army about one-half of its soldiers, and to her navy almost two-thirds of its seamen¹; and which, *after paying the expenses of its own extravagant Government, and many useless establishments, is able to pour without reserve or return, four millions annually into the lap of Britain*²; even perhaps an infinitely larger sum, if a fair estimate could be made of the enormous rents, unproductively remitted to Irish absentees—and of the losses, that Ireland still sustains, which for a century, annihilated her trade, in every article but linen; and which, by their surviving consequences, still continue to surrender her foreign and domestic markets to a country, in natural productions, as well as in every commercial and manufacturing point of view, essentially her rival.”

The charge has been made frequently, and the evidence has never been wanting, that England from the beginning even to our day has followed a settled purpose in her determination that the Irish people and Ireland should never prosper. The writer, however, is not aware that any of her statesmen have been as outspoken as the younger Pitt, the British Minister, while debating the Irish commercial

¹ See Appendix, note 19.

² If the importance of this statement be fully appreciated, the reader must be impressed with the profound degree of knowledge Mr. Emmet possessed in relation to the state of Ireland at the time of which he was writing. While the conditions Mr. Emmet has described must have existed long before his birth and have remained unchanged to the present day, they seem until recently to have attracted no special attention. What he has written on the financial condition of the country at that time might have been penned by a member of the recent Commission of the British Parliament to investigate the present over-taxation of Ireland; and his views coincide particularly with those held by Mr. Sexton.

proposition on the 22d of February, 1785. He spoke as follows¹:

“The species of policy which had been exercised by the Government of England in regard to Ireland had for its object to debar the latter from the enjoyment of her own resources, and to make her completely subservient to the opulence and interests of England; that she had not been suffered to share in the bounties of nature or the industries of its citizens!!!”

Here we have the whole story. Comment is unnecessary.

¹ See Debret's *Parliamentary Register*.

CHAPTER III

IRELAND PAUPERIZED BY ILLEGAL TAXATION SINCE THE "UNION" WITH ENGLAND

THE great wrong to Ireland was the robbery of her legislative powers and, consequently, of the liberty of her people; for no medium exists through which she can now right a national grievance in accordance with the expressed desire of a national majority.

This condition, however, was foreseen by all who opposed the "Union," as an inevitable consequence. But no one seems to have anticipated the possibility of the state of affairs now existing in Ireland in relation to the financial condition of the country. It is the direct result of over-taxation, exacted year after year by England from Ireland, with the same justice as that by which a robber acquires possession after having overpowered his victim. The general effect is easy of demonstration, but the reader might find it difficult to grasp the subject in detail unless it be presented by giving at some length the views of different writers; this cannot be done without repetition.

Battersby states¹:

"Whilst the Union was to have diminished debt and taxes in Ireland, it has created an augmentation, not equalled in times of foreign war or domestic 'rebellion'; so great was this increase, that the Finance Committee of 1815 declared that those which were regarded as permanent imports exceeded the increase of Great Britain by nearly a *third*; reckoning from the beginning

¹ P. 167.

of the war, this committee reported that the increase of the taxation of England of all kinds was 21 to 10; while the increase in Ireland was 46 $\frac{3}{4}$ to 10!

“Notwithstanding this increase of *drain* on the Irish people in the shape of taxes, our old ally the *debt* went on ‘progressively advancing’—so much so that the Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer, on proposing the consolidation of the Exchequers, complained that the contribution of Ireland was greater than she ought to have been called on to bear. (Hansard’s *Debates*, vol. xxxiv., p. 589.) ‘You have,’ said this functionary, ‘contracted with her for an expenditure she could not meet, your own share of which you could not meet but by sacrifices unexampled—by exertions, the tension of which only England could have borne. Ireland has been led to expect that her expenditure would have been less than before she was united with you. In the fifteen years preceding the Union it amounted to £41,000,000, but in the fifteen years of Union it swelled to the enormous amount of £148,000,000. The increase of her revenue would have more than discharged, without loans, an expenditure greater than that of the 15 years preceding 1801. Ireland has absolutely paid in taxes more than 78 millions, being 47 millions more than her revenue, in the 15 years upon which her contribution has been circulated.’ Again (page 601): ‘Your own committee had shown that an advance in permanent taxation Ireland had made, even greater, in proportion to her former revenue, than Great Britain.’ ”

Battersby continues:

“See the blessed effects of our ‘amalgamation with England.’ By bad laws and worse government, the latter now—1833—owes the enormous sum of £800,000,000; calculating on the Union principle, Ireland is now saddled with £134,000,000. At the utmost Ireland should not, allowing that she should participate in England’s loss, have to pay more than £32,000,000, and it can be proved that the sum on equitable grounds should not exceed £24,000,000. Can such a partnership as this then serve Ireland?”

(Page 154) “*We ask then again, have these pledges been kept?*

Was Ireland—agreeable to the act of Union—subjected only to her proportion of taxes, when, in 1816, the period of consolidation arrived? Did the *revisions of contracts* as pointed out in the 7th Article of the Union take place? Was not England to liquidate down to the proportion of $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, and not that Ireland should rise to that proportion? Lord Castlereagh took the exports and imports in 1800, as 7 to 1, those for Ireland being in the three years preceding the Union £10,225,000, and those for Great Britain being £73,961,000. The imports and exports of Ireland for 1816, seen in Finance Accounts of 1816, were £13,182,999, while the British were £96,971,476, making the British proportion *greater* than that of 1800. The articles of consumption alluded to were malt, spirits, wine, tea, tobacco, sugar, and coffee. The following were the relative proportions of the two countries in 1816:

GREAT BRITAIN IN 1816	IRELAND, 1816
Malt.....£5,691,369.....	£ 655,327
Home Spirits.....2,686,277.....	1,422,317
Foreign Spirits.....2,495,658.....	17,656
Wine.....1,619,299.....	167,158
Tea.....2,956,719.....	405,777
Tobacco.....2,035,109.....	750,510
Sugar.....3,166,851.....	445,341
Coffee.....290,834.....	8,192
<hr/> £20,933,116	<hr/> £3,872,278

Here we have a proportion of nearly 1 to 6, *arising manifestly from the increased taxation of Ireland*, but adding the above amounts to the totals of exports and imports according to the Castlereagh plan, there is a proportion of about 1 to 7, and the grand proportion of the Union was 1 to $7\frac{1}{2}$! This does not show that the ‘circumstances’ in 1816 had altered more than *fractionally* from those of 1800, though they were supposed to be such as to warrant an equalization of all duties and responsibilities notwithstanding the inordinate increase of Irish taxation.

“At the period of the Union, 420 millions of debt, with which Ireland had nothing to do, required an annual taxation to the extent of £15,800,000, and hence the income tax of 1800, amounting to nearly £6,000,000 a year, and other taxes peculiar to Great Britain. Ireland having been declared, in 1816, unable to bear what was called her own debt, it was enacted by the Imperial Parliament that they should be subject to this enormous

mass of *British* debt. Being insolvent, it was enacted that she should have the responsibilities of teeming wealth. Being decidedly unable to contribute 1 to 7½, it was enacted that she should not only contribute 1 to 3, as to the future, but as to the past. . . .

“The effect of the ‘consolidation’ has been, that it has given us war taxes in the eighteenth year of peace. If the taxes repealed in Ireland since the war be contrasted, they will be found to be nearly equal. There have been enormous retrenchments of expenditure in this country, but we have had no benefit from them. Every penny saved has gone to the Exchequer, committed for nearly sixteen millions annually of taxes before the national *partnership* was formed, and has been lost to this country. *Thus, by the Union we have got our debt raised from 7 millions—in 1797—to 134 millions! demanding an annual charge beyond the whole revenue of the country.* Whilst the taxes of England between 1791 and 1815 were raised in the proportion of 10 to 21½, those of Ireland increased as from 10 to 44¾; or in other words, Ireland’s taxes increased as from one to four, while those of England increased only as one to two! (see Finance Report of 1815) and since 1815, the proportion has been still greater against Ireland.”

The reader will see that this disproportion has steadily increased to the present time, with Ireland’s loss and England’s increase of population.

Battersby continues the subject (page 145):

“Need we ask, has the pledge relating to the *Debt* been kept? Alas! like every other part of the unnatural compact, it was false in its beginning, and is still falser in its end! Pitt and Castle-reagh, anticipating the holy union of the sister and mother country, contrived to increase the Irish debt to such an extent, that for the two years of rebellion it exceeded by nearly eight millions what it was for the four years preceding. Thus according to the Government account of the revenue (published by Grierson in 1800, p. 81) whilst the national debt in:

1794 was	£3,133,790. 0 0
1795 was	4,353,990. 0 0
1796 was	6,041,856.13 4
1797 was	<u>7,082,256.13 4</u>

Or for the four years, only.....£20,591,893. 6 8

In 1798 it was only £11,059,256.13 4

In 1799 it was 17,466,540. 0 0

Or in these two years more than in the former, the sum of £28,525,796.13 4
 7,933,903. 6 8

“To form an idea how this augmentation was created, we have only to look up p. 85, of the same *official document*, where we find that whilst the expense of the army in Ireland for 1795, was only £1,688,538.8.5 $\frac{3}{4}$, the expense of the same in 1798—paid in 1799—was £4,286,602.18.4 $\frac{3}{4}$. The keeping up of an additional army in Ireland—and Pitt borrowing three millions on the *credit of Ireland*, on the 14th of February, 1800, augmented the debt of Ireland in January, 1801, to £26,841,219, whilst the debt of Great Britain was £420,000,000. Ireland’s debt then bore the interest at £1,086,977,—of which £478,175 was paid in Great Britain—thus leaving the interest of Great Britain at about £16,000,000. In the Act of the Union, there was an express provision, guaranteeing Ireland from any responsibility with the English debt previous to 1801; consequently not for one penny of the aforesaid 420 millions. The time, however, for the consolidation of the Exchequer arrived in 1816, and then the ‘paternal governors’ of England decided that Ireland should share the burdens created before, as well as those after the Union!

“Thus our whole territory is mortgaged not only for our own debt, but for that of Great Britain, in violation of the sacred compact. Hence, instead of our proportion of £380,000,000, we are saddled with that of £800,000,000. Thus is not only the solemn pledge broken, but the *fundamental part of the Act of Union* is already repealed by the *imperial legislature*! Are we then to be told that the Union cannot be repealed without blood, whilst in defiance of the most sacred pledge, the legislature of England had already repealed what is in favor of England? Men of England! Men of justice—is such an Union as this a righteous bond? But this is not all. The alleged amount of the debt to the consolidation of the Exchequer in January, 1817, was £44,888,355 (*Report of the State of the Poor*, p. 837), being the excess of expenditure over income, between 1800 and 1817; this was at least £20,000,000 over the additional debt, for which Ireland should have been justly responsible, if the ‘parent legislature

had acted fair towards her.' Mr. V. Fitzgerald then said that 'for the 15 years preceding the Union the debt was only £41,000,000, whereas for the 15 years succeeding, it was £148,000,000' (Hansard's *Debates*, vol. xxxiv., p. 389). Hence he said that 'Ireland contracted for an expenditure she was not able to bear.' Had he said that she was saddled with several millions more than England declared should be her part, he would have spoken more correctly. The just ratio of ability—as to debt—should have been 1 to 11. In that proportion taxes should *then* have been imposed and the debt levied: and if that had been the case, the Irish debt between 1800 and 1817, would not have exceeded 24 millions. But if the faith-keeping legislature of England kept her promise with Ireland, even this 24 millions would have been paid by Ireland, as Mr. Staunton has ably shown; so that if a final settlement were now made—1833—in accordance with the terms of the 'compact,' Ireland would not only shew clean hands, but a debt against England on these five counts:

"1st. The uncredited taxes since 1800.

"2nd. The full amount of relief withheld from Ireland since the war.

"3rd. The amount of Revenue raised in direct violation of the 6th article of the Union, on salt, hops, coals, etc.

"4th. The amount of undue taxation, or such taxation produced by an increase of permanent burdens since the Union, disproportioned to the increase of such burdens in Great Britain.

"5th. Surplus revenue, which, according to the 7th Article of the Union should have been applied to local improvements in Ireland.

"Thus the state of the case, as to the debt between Great Britain and Ireland, even on the Union act, if justice were done since that, would be:

Due to Ireland by balance of transfers.....	£ 6,587,000
Amount of taxation imposed in violation of the Union.....	5,000,000
Excessive taxation preceding the consolidation.....	20,000,000
Unacknowledged taxation since.....	8,000,000
Relief due to Ireland agreeable to the Union.....	15,000,000
	<hr/>
	£54,587,000
From which deduct as above.....	44,888,000
	<hr/>
Balance in favour of Ireland.....	£ 9,699,000

“See Mr. Staunton’s able article on the national debt. Sums received and paid for reduction of national debt. Report, 29th of February, 1822:

Great Britain.....	£5,270,072.16. 6
Ireland	333,720.14. 4
	£5,703,793.10.10

“Where, then, is the candid Englishman, who, viewing such a scandalous violation of a pledge, will not exclaim with General Cockburn, that ‘*a more iniquitous, outrageous act of injustice and robbery, never was equalled in all the plundering atrocities of nations!*’

“Need we tell the timid politicians, who say Ireland could not pay her debt, even allowing it to be £54,000,000, with a separate legislature, that one year of *a reformed legislature in Ireland* would settle that debt; whereas, it is probable it never can be settled in an English legislature with its £800,000,000 of debt, unless by a universal bankruptcy. By such a legislature in Ireland, selling off the Church lands—allowing all classes to support their own clergy—which would bring 30 or 40 millions; by taxing the absentees and preventing the present annual drain of £4,000,000; by cultivating at least 3,000,000 out of the 5,000,000 of the present unprofitable acres in Ireland; and by having the amount of the undue taxes now levied devoted to this national purpose, Ireland’s national debt—allowing it even to be £50,000,000—could be paid in one year; and this country, by a system of just legislature and economy, might be one of the most flourishing nations of the world.

“Shall we continue to ask have the pledges made at the Union been kept? Alas! even at the moment of perpetrating the fell act the treaty was broken, and what are we to expect since?

“‘The uniform conduct of the British Government and the imperial parliament towards Ireland, since her incorporated union with Great Britain,’ Mr. Plowden¹ observes, ‘has tended rather to disappoint and irritate, than to soothe and conciliate her affections for Great Britain. Not one of those flattering objects have been realized, which the Irish before the Union had

¹ The quotation is taken, it is supposed, from Plowden’s *Historical Reviews*, etc.

been taught to expect from the liberality of an imperial Parliament, uninfluenced by the local prejudices of their own senate. As every effort to improve the condition of Ireland, attempted in the imperial parliament, has failed, the Irish naturally consider the redress of their grievances more remote and desperate than whilst they had a parliament of their own. To the imperial parliament they send not one-sixth of the representatives¹—and can therefore claim no control over the present house of commons.”

Sir Edward Clarke delivered a speech in Plymouth, England, on the condition of Ireland and, in reference to the terms of the Union between England and Ireland, spoke as follows²:

“ By that act Ireland was to bear two-seventeenths of the taxation of the whole country, and that did not seem to be an unfair arrangement. Taking into consideration the population of the two islands at that time it amounted to this, that by the act of the Union every individual in Great Britain would pay three and a half times as much as a person in Ireland, and there was no reason to believe that there was any neglect of Ireland’s interest, at the time that act was passed.”³

The population of Great Britain in 1801 was a little less than eleven millions, while that of Ireland at that date is in more doubt. Different writers of the period estimated it to have been over four millions. Evidently the estimate of Sir Edward Clarke was based on these figures, which would be correct in regard to the supposed population of the two countries at that time. But the comparison is not a fair one regarding the ability to pay *per capita*, as the number of those who could pay any proportion of tax has always been greater in England than in Ireland. The agreement made at the “Union” was that after twenty years the proportion should be readjusted and that at no time should Ireland

¹ The representation of Ireland in the British Parliament has been treated of elsewhere at some length.

² From the newspaper reports.

³ In relation to this subject let the reader refer to the views of Newenham already given.

be called upon to pay a proportion *beyond her comparative ability!* As usual, this compact on the part of England has not been observed.

Mr. Fox has given us the following¹:

"Ireland had no public debt till within a few years of Grattan's Parliament, and only owed two millions of pounds down to within two years of the Union; in which year the debt rose to nearly twenty-seven millions of pounds. The increase was due to the policy of the English Government, Pitt having spent two millions of pounds, or thereabouts, in a wholesale system of bribery, the steady object of his Irish policy being, according to Mr. Lecky—'to corrupt and degrade, in order that he might ultimately destroy the Legislature of the country.' Further, Mr. Lecky accuses Pitt of having deliberately provoked the rebellion of 1798² for party purposes, which was quenched in blood at an expenditure of twenty-two millions of pounds, and this enormous sum, with the millions spent in bribery, was added to the public debt of Ireland."

Nor is this all.

"At the time of the Union it was solemnly agreed and arranged that Ireland's contributions to the Imperial expenditure, as compared with that of Great Britain, should be as one to seven and a half, a proportion which was strongly objected to by the opponents of the Union as greater than Ireland should be called upon to bear, having regard to her relative ability. It was arranged, also, that Ireland's taxation should not be raised to the standard of Great Britain until two conditions should be reached: 1. That the debts of the two countries should come to bear to each other the proportion of fifteen parts for Great Britain to two parts to Ireland; and, 2. That the circumstance of the two countries should admit of uniform taxation. The two Exchequers were to be kept separate meanwhile, but the English Government took care that the period should be short, for in 1817, that is sixteen years after the Union, the Irish debt was increased to one

¹ P. 139.

² The writer has already given expression to the same accusation as the result of his investigations and, before Mr. Lecky's work had been published, he had written what has been submitted to the reader.

hundred and twenty-one millions of pounds, and the two Exchequers were, in violation of a solemn engagement, summarily amalgamated. The English debt was increased by less than one half, while the Irish debt was quadrupled, thus bringing the latter up to the proportion insisted on by Castlereagh, by which Parliament was enabled, under the Seventh Article of the Union, to abolish separate quotas of contribution, and henceforth tax the two countries indiscriminately."

The following table, contained in a Parliamentary return, No. 35, issued in 1819, exhibits the financial progress made by Ireland on the road to ruin to gratify Pitt's idea of Imperial unity; which has, as Mr. Lecky says, "by uniting the Legislatures, divided the nation."

YEAR	BRITISH DEBT	ANNUAL CHARGE	IRISH DEBT	ANNUAL CHARGE
Jan. 5, 1801	£450,504,984	£17,718,851	£28,545,134	£1,244,462
Jan. 5, 1817	£734,522,104	£28,238,416	£112,704,773	£4,104,514

From the day the "Union" was declared, Ireland's capacity for paying her quota of the Imperial taxes began to lessen and for the past fifty years her population has steadily been diminishing. Before the first decade had passed, after the "Union," Ireland's taxes should have been readjusted had they been based on her ability to pay them. On the other hand, if the adjustment was based on her population, England, with any sense of justice to Ireland, should have realized the fact that the country was becoming rapidly depleted by famine, fever and the emigration of those best fitted to pay those taxes; and yet the taxes remain unchanged!

When the Home Rule Bill of Mr. Gladstone was introduced into Parliament, it became necessary to investigate every source of revenue and wealth then existing in the two countries and to gain all other necessary information, to adjust fairly Ireland's proportion of the taxes. The investiga-

tion was referred to a committee on May 25, 1894, and it finally made an exhaustive report. To a great extent, by means of Mr. Sexton's industry and sagacity as one of the committee, it was made apparent that Ireland was being overtaxed to a degree which amounted to confiscation of all her limited resources.

On referring again to the newspaper reports of Sir Edward Clarke's speech delivered at Plymouth, on "Ireland's Overtaxation," who was also a member of the above committee, we find he states:

"It was a very strong Committee indeed," and he "could not refuse to accept the conclusions of fact at which that Committee had arrived." And again: "The result was that the moderate estimate given by the Committee was that, whereas while Ireland now paid over one-thirteenth of the taxes, her wealth was only equal to one-eighteenth part, and her true taxable capacity was only equal to one-twentieth part. Now, how had this come about? The free import policy adopted earlier in the century by Parliament had the result of taking the taxes off a number of things that came from abroad, things far more largely consumed in the richer, than in the poorer country and, therefore, the so-called free trade policy had relieved the tax-payers of Great Britain more than those of Ireland."

But this explanation cannot be accepted as an extenuation; for the consequences must have been fully realized beforehand and the Act in question would certainly never have been passed by Parliament unless England was to have been benefited thereby.

Sir Edward Clarke continues:

"Between 1853 and 1860, the taxes in Ireland were increased to an extent which had added to the burdens of that country, ever since 1860, a sum of nearly two and a half millions a year. In 1853 the taxation of spirits in this country (England) was seven shillings and ten pence per gallon, which was raised in 1860 to ten shillings. In Ireland, in 1853, the tax upon the spirits was only two shillings and eight pence per gallon, but it was raised

to ten shillings by 1860, and it was the changes almost entirely made by Mr. Gladstone in the taxation of these subjects and in the relief of the imports which had imposed upon Ireland the additional burden of two and a half millions of which complaint is now made."

It is doubtful if this explanation be the correct one, from the fact, as we shall see hereafter, that the Irish people proved to be more temperate than was anticipated. Moreover, Mr. Emmet pointed out that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Irish people were being overtaxed to about the same extent as the Parliamentary Commission has shown to be the excess at present. An investigation made by this Commission has proved that Ireland has been thus robbed, through unjust taxation, of *over six hundred millions of dollars during the past fifty years!*¹

It was claimed by some of the members of the Commission that the excess of taxation was even greater—that, according to the rate agreed upon in the Act of "Union," Ireland has contributed yearly to the Imperial Exchequer an excess of some seventeen millions more than her just proportion, thus increasing the amount to eight hun-

¹ Morrison Davidson tells us in *Reynold's Newspaper*, London, file 1901: "In 1820 the taxation of the commodities in Britain was two pounds eight shillings per head, and in Ireland eleven shillings. In 1894, the figures were one pound four shillings and one pound two shillings respectively. In the period 1851-1885, two million, five hundred thousand pounds (twelve million, five hundred thousand dollars) were added to the taxation of Ireland, to make up, presumably, for the decline in population! Since 1850 *British taxes have diminished three shillings per head, and Irish increased fourteen shillings eleven pence!* In Britain the taxation, 1901, of commodities is only *twenty-three per cent. of her total*; whereas in Ireland it is *seventy-six per cent.*"

In the House of Commons on Thursday, May 9, 1901, during the debate on the "maintenance bill for the King's allowance," it was shown that Ireland with her greatly reduced population was then paying of the Imperial expenses a proportion twice as great as she did eighteen years before while that paid by England was now twenty-five per cent. less than formerly.

The Irish people have bitterly complained of this great injustice, where the officials of England fix an arbitrary rate without reference to population or prosperity, by which the proportion assigned to Ireland has always been excessive and that for England much less proportionately.

dred and fifty millions of pounds in excess of her just proportion.

The London *Times* and other newspapers in Great Britain, true to the usual policy of keeping the English people in absolute ignorance of the truth regarding Irish affairs, have flippantly put aside this charge of overtaxation with the advice to the people of Ireland to drink less whiskey and their taxes would be lighter! Let it be due to poverty or to any other cause, the fact has long been known that in Ireland the average consumption of spirits and malt liquors, for each individual member of the population, has been very much less than in either England or Scotland. In round numbers the proportion may be stated as being twice as great in England and nearly three times as great in Scotland; or, if the proportion be taken on the monetary value of all liquors consumed, the yearly average has been estimated at nineteen dollars for every man, woman and child in Great Britain. And by the same standard it is shown that the average expenditure for each Englishman is \$20.50; for the Scotchman, \$15.25, and for the Irishman, \$13.25. This shows that the Irishman, in relation to the population and the quantity consumed, is not only more temperate but pays on the average a higher price. His taste is evidently for a better quality.

The late Lord Farrer, who was also a member of the Parliamentary Committee referred to, treated the cause of Ireland's overtaxation as follows, showing (see newspaper report):

"that in the last years for which accounts are given, 1893-94, Ireland paid into the Common Fund, in round numbers, £7,570,000, and took out of it, in the form of expenditure on Irish services, £5,600,000, leaving about £2,000,000 as her contribution towards what is called Imperial services. These services cost in 1892-93 about £62,000,000. Taking that figure, which is less than their present cost, Ireland's contribution to the expenses of the Empire was less than one-thirtieth of the whole. The relative taxable capacity of Ireland is estimated by the Commission

at not less than one-twentieth or one twenty-first of that of the United Kingdom—it is fair to add that many of the Irish members thought it much less,—and it is upon this proportion, which was adopted by the English members, that most of the arguments of the Irish members are founded. But instead of contributing one-twentieth part, or one twenty-first part of £62,000,000, Ireland actually contributed only one-thirtieth, or £2,000,000.”

Now, to place the subject in a few words, it may be stated that, after Ireland has been made to pay whatever sum the British Government sees fit to spend in holding the country, of which England pays no part, she is still expected to pay her quota towards meeting the Imperial expenses elsewhere and this demand is made without reference to her diminished population or her impaired financial condition.

It was recently stated in Parliament by one of the Irish members that the tax in Ireland for 1901 was two pounds eighteen shillings per head while before the Union, just one hundred years ago, it was only six shillings and eight pence per head. Therefore the expenses in Ireland have greatly increased, particularly since 1894, when it was shown that the annual cost of local government for the Irish people was about five dollars *per capita* while in England it was less than three dollars! For a great many years past the expenditures made by the British Government in Ireland have been both wilful and wasteful. The country has been made the refuge for England's younger sons, sent there to fill unnecessary offices both civil and military or sinecure positions especially created for them.

The excessive numbers of the constabulary force and the number of troops which have been stationed in Ireland, ostensibly to keep the peace but rather to hold the country, have not been needed for years. The constabulary in Ireland, without reference to the number of troops, at a time when the country outside of Ulster has been free from all disturbances for years numbers between thirteen and fourteen thousand men and is maintained at a cost of nearly ten millions of dollars by means of additional taxes on the

Irish people. This is done notwithstanding that England has long known that the people of Ireland have been patiently waiting for their leaders to gain Home Rule by constitutional measures and that an outbreak, unless forced by the Government, is not possible in Ireland's prostrated condition.

When the population of Ireland was twice as great as at present, six thousand men in the constabulary force was considered a sufficient number to preserve the peace. At the beginning of the century, with the population reduced to about four millions and a half, the constabulary has been increased, it is claimed, to at least fourteen thousand men. There were over thirty thousand troops in Ireland when the war with the Boers compelled the English Government "to leave the country unprotected." During the progress of the war, while Ireland was left "unprotected," the country was never in a more profound state of peace. Yet history will repeat itself and Ireland will be compelled again to support these troops, or a greater number, as soon as they can be spared from South Africa; then, by their presence in Ireland, fresh disorder will be excited; with a pretext for keeping them longer in the country at the expense of the Irish people.

From one of the Dublin papers, published in June, 1892, the following statement was taken; is doubtless authentic, being based upon the published public records:

"Any one who wants to realize how indefensible a burden the Irish police force is, compared with that of any other country in the world, has only to turn to the Annual Report (just issued as a Parliamentary paper) of the strength and cost of the constabulary force of Scotland. The population of Scotland, be it remembered, is proven by the recent census to be now greater than that of Ireland, besides being immeasurably richer. The present strength of the constabulary in Scotland is 1779 for the country forces, and 3139 in the city and borough forces,—a total of 4918 men, in comparison with 13,000 in Ireland, where there is a smaller population and infinitely less serious crime. The

difference in cost is no less striking. The total for the general cost, pay, clothing, etc., of the Scottish constabulary amounts to £191,000 a year in the counties and £298,000 for the cities and boroughs—in all a grand total of £490,000, in contrast with—in round numbers—£1,500,000 a year for the constabulary and metropolitan police of Ireland. How the Irish police establishment can survive that comparison we cannot comprehend. Observe that 1779 men do the entire rural policing of Scotland, while at least 10,000 of the Irish police are engaged on rural duty. The 3139 Scotch city police have to cope with the crime of a number of manufacturing cities—one of which, Glasgow, has all but a million of inhabitants,—while Ireland, Dublin, and Belfast are the only cities in anything like the same category. Suppose Ireland were to be policed in the same manner as richer and more populous and more criminal Scotland, the force would have to be reduced from 15,000 to 5000 and the yearly expenditure would enable us to make a saving in round numbers of £1,000,000 per annum—viz., from £1,500,000 to £500,000!”

Instead of the cost of government in Ireland being greater than it is in England, it should be reduced at least one-half by reasonable regard for economy and with a simpler form of government; which is also best fitted for the country in its present exhausted condition.

It has been impossible to obtain any accurate information of the number of overpaid officials employed in Ireland and of those filling sinecure positions. The charge of corruption has, however, existed too many years without being disproved and it is generally believed to be true that every branch of service within control of the English Government is filled without the slightest consideration for the interest of Ireland; her people meanwhile are taxed for the support of every official. The only definite statement, bearing on any special branch of service, is the following from an editorial in an Irish newspaper which so far as it covers the subject is doubtless reliable, as the authority is stated:

“For instance, there are thirty-two county court judges in Ireland in receipt of from \$7500 to \$10,000 a year. Five or six

judges could easily do the work of these county court judges, but these county judges draw their salaries for six weeks' or two months' work, and then spend the balance of their time acting as directors of railroad or other companies or writing political articles for the newspapers or periodicals, abusing the enemies of the system of which they are the embodiment.

"The supreme court judges are in like manner five times too many, and they receive salaries ranging from \$17,500 to \$25,000 a year. And they are all politicians, truculent, abusive, and tyrannical. Sir Robert Hamilton, one of the ablest administrators of the age, made a thorough investigation of the corrupt extravagance of the Castle Government in Ireland and he submitted a report to Mr. Gladstone showing that \$10,000,000 a year could be saved in the cost of Irish administration under a Home Rule Government."

John Boyle O'Reilly, in the preface written by him for Mrs. Ellen Foster's Work *The Crime Against Ireland*, gives the situation truthfully:

"Instead of a hopeless but heroic pike against a long-range rifle, Ireland has learned to depend upon a weapon that carries farther than a cannon,—patient explanation. Instead of striking her enemy in the face, as of old, and getting strangled in the dark, Ireland arraigns the oppressor before mankind, and asks the world for a verdict. The passionate one binds her heart into submission and reasons instead of rebelling."

It is the oft-told story that Ireland to-day has no commerce and foreign capital is engaged in taking out of the country, day by day, every available product to meet her obligations. She has no longer any manufactures and her so-called Irish industries, which have been partially revived by philanthropic effort during the past few years, are not worthy of mention so far as the people at large are benefited while her agricultural products are, during the prosperous years only, in excess of the quantity needed to feed her reduced population; yet it is not possible to keep them in the country.

History seems to repeat itself in the innumerable local famines from which Ireland has suffered; for the policy of the Government has been to make no effort at alleviation, even after it has become evident that the occurrence of the famine is inevitable and notwithstanding that it is in a position to know the true situation long before the people. As a rule the same waste of time by masterly inactivity has always been observed by the Government, until the charitable throughout the world have been appealed to for aid. Then, if the publicity of the situation forces Governmental action, the Englishman, with total lack of sympathy, inflates himself with pride at the charitable action of his Government in possibly sending a few thousand pounds to Ireland, of which appropriation the Irish people had contributed more than their proportion, to be spent judiciously among the "friends of the Government."

Individuals among the English people may for a while, if the famine continue, lay aside their inborn prejudice against "the lazy Irish" and render them assistance from charitable motives. But not one penny has the English Government, be it Whig or Tory, ever expended in Ireland, in the name of charity or otherwise, without exacting "the pound of flesh" by forcing her, at some time, to pay back both principal and interest.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINANCIAL RELATION OF IRELAND AND ENGLAND

AFTER the final report of the Committee or Commission, appointed by Parliament to inquire into the Financial Relations of Great Britain and Ireland, had been made and no action taken Mr. Edward Blake, an Irish member, moved, March 29, 1897, that the report be taken from the table and brought before the House for discussion. In a masterly statement of the Irish case Mr. Blake said¹:

"I ask British members to recall the economic conditions of the two islands—the ruling and the ruled. They should give pause before the dismissal of our plaint. Take

"POPULATION.

"It is a great test, and involves a great element of strength. At the beginning Ireland had five millions against a little over ten millions in Britain. She has now four and a half millions, less by half a million or ten per cent. in the century. Britain has now thirty-four millions, having increased by twenty-four millions, or 240 per cent. Had Ireland increased proportionately, she would have had over fifteen millions; her relative loss is ten and a half millions in the century. She had half as many: she has little more than one-eighth of Britain. But even this view is inadequate. Only half a century ago Ireland had eight and a half millions. She lost two millions directly and indirectly through the famine; and since then so many more that, after eliminating the natural increase, her population has actually

¹ Reported in the *Freeman's Journal*, Dublin, March 30, 1897.
vol. II.—4.

diminished by four millions—forty-seven per cent.,—an absolutely unexampled condition. Britain half a century ago had twenty millions; she has increased by fourteen millions, or seventy per cent. A proportionate Irish increase would make an Irish population of 14,300,000. Her relative loss is near ten millions, or seventy per cent. in half a century.

“ TAKE THE CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.

“ Of this dreadfully reduced population there are large masses whose scale of existence is far below that of the corresponding masses of Britain, while Britain's increased numbers enjoy a steady and rapid advance in the standard of comfort. In Britain the scale of living and the margin available for emergencies make famine unknown and impossible. In Ireland the scale is so low and the margin so narrow that even a single bad crop tends in important areas to famine, necessitating public aid. In '79-'80, in '86, in '91, in '94, you were obliged to pass Relief of Distress Acts for Ireland (Irish cheers). In England there is no Congested Districts Board. In Ireland one-sixth of the country and near one-eighth of the population are thus dealt with. The average Poor-Law valuation of the area is £1 *os.* 2*d.* Many equally poor districts are excluded from the Act. There is painful evidence of chronic penury and want in those parts; reports which would absolutely appal. Britain imports from Ireland and abroad for her masses vast quantities of the best foods, in addition to what she raises. Ireland raises great supplies of the best foods, which she is obliged largely to export to Britain, and to replace by inferior commodities, Indian corn and American bacon, the best her poverty-stricken masses can afford to use. Ireland is, in proportion to population, the fourth meat producer in the world, but only the sixteenth meat consumer. For England the conditions are reversed. She is the sixteenth meat producer, but the fourth meat consumer. The average Poor-Law valuation of all Ireland is under £3, about equal to the poorest East London union. The paupers of Ireland were per 1000 in '64, 52; of Britain, 49; nearly equal proportions. In '95 they were in Ireland 95, being nearly doubled; for Britain, 26, being almost half. From equality, they have become nearly 4 to 1.

Emigration has been draining from Ireland those in the prime of life. The very young and the very old remain. Thus the absolute and relative efficiency of the population has been lowered. Inferior conditions have produced other painful results. The proportion of deaf-mutes is near one-third larger than in England; of blind, two-fifths; of lunatics, one-third. And the proportions of births over deaths is in Ireland, five; in Britain, over eleven.

“TAKE MANUFACTURES AND AGRICULTURE.

“Irish manufactures have largely declined. While between 1841 and 1891 the whole population decreased forty-two per cent., the manufacturing population decreased sixty-one per cent. Now only twenty-seven per cent. of the population is urban. In the same time the manufactures of Britain have immeasurably increased, and now seventy-one per cent. of her population is urban. The figures are about reversed. Thus, Ireland has become more and more dependent upon the land; seventy-three per cent. of her people live in the country, and sixty-four per cent. are directly dependent upon agriculture. It follows that she has suffered enormously, absolutely and relatively by the fall in prices, accentuated by the loss of local town markets; and her gross and net returns from agriculture have been very greatly reduced, involving the loss of a large proportion of her yearly resources. Britain has become more and more independent of agriculture. Under twenty-nine per cent. of her people are rural; and therefore she has been less affected as a country by the fall in prices; while agriculture itself has been helped by the widespreading urban districts, which have turned agricultural areas into market gardens and town-supply farms, a process which ought to be much accelerated.

“TAKE COMMERCE.

“Ireland has hardly any foreign commerce or investments, and a large part of her yearly income is drained away by absentee landlords and mortgagees. Britain is still the great manufacturer, merchant, carrier, and lender of the world, whose wealth she drains. Though Ireland still has a population of between

one-seventh and one-eighth of Britain's, the number of her railway passengers is but one thirty-seventh; of tons of railway freight, one-seventieth; of telegrams, one-eighteenth, and of money and postal orders, one-nineteenth—facts which prove her comparative stagnation.

“TAKE RESOURCES.

“Sir Robert Giffen's conclusion is that taking into account all circumstances the incomes of the wage-earning classes in Ireland are, man for man, little more than half those of Great Britain. The gross income or yearly resources of Ireland are estimated too highly at 70 millions; those of Britain too low at 1400 millions, or twenty-fold. The capital of Ireland was reckoned in 1820 at 563 millions, or over one-third that of Britain, which was 1500 millions. Ireland is thought now to have 400 millions, or nearly one-third reduction, and Britain over 10,000, or over sevenfold increase. Ireland has gone down relatively from one-third to one twenty-fifth or less.

Sir, these comparisons might be easily multiplied and enlarged upon, but the bald statement proves that the conditions of the two islands you govern are wholly different and increasingly diverging in the extent of their resources, in the kinds of their resources, and in their economic circumstances and interests. They show that your rule has advanced you but failed to prosper her. They prove that her situation demands the just and generous consideration of the rich and powerful rulers of the weak and poor island whose destinies you control. Let me add this one contrasting fact,—that on which our present claim is founded. The one great point in which Britain exhibits a decline and Ireland an advance is in the scale of taxation! In Ireland the taxes on commodities which strike the masses were per head in 1790, 4s.; in 1820, 11s.; in 1894, 22s.; they were doubled. In Britain, they were—in 1820, 43s.; in 1894, 24s.; they were halved. The Irish taxes, which had been under one-fourth, have become almost equal, notwithstanding the relative poverty of the country. Sir, may I deal, before considering our rights under the Union Act, with one cardinal point of economic fact; the relative taxable capacity of the two islands, as contrasted with their actual taxation? For the purposes of this debate it is

enough to show the maximum estimate of Ireland's relative capacity, reached by any one of twelve out of thirteen commissioners. The Joint Report finds that 'while the actual tax revenue of Ireland is about one-eleventh of that of Britain the relative taxable capacity of Ireland is very much smaller,

“AND IS NOT ESTIMATED BY ANY OF US TO EXCEED ONE-TWENTIETH.’

“This conclusion was reached after two years' examination and consideration by eminent experts, financiers, statisticians, and Treasury officials. Let me, because of the imputation of bias, leave out all the Irish members, though some of them, at any rate, ought to count in this question. Let me consider the British members only, who also, by the same reasoning, may have been unconsciously biased against us. It was reached substantially by Mr. Childers, the first chairman, a distinguished economist and financier, an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer; a man retired from party politics, who devoted the last years of his life to this great public service, in the discharge of which he died. It was reached by Lords Farrer and Welby, who had filled the highest posts in the British Treasury and in the Board of Trade—posts demanding and developing the qualities most required for the work; and whose public services had been rewarded by seats in the Upper Chamber, which was honoured and strengthened by their accession to its ranks. It was reached by the late Mr. Currie a man of the highest reputation in these walks, who had proved his powers in other posts; and by Professor Hunter, a late colleague of ours, whose brain-power, knowledge and industry are well known here. It was reached substantially by Sir David Barbour, dissentient on other grounds, whose distinguished career abroad may perhaps permit him to be admitted as impartial, though marked by Irish birth. There remains just one British member—perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer would say the just one—a colleague of ours, who does not give assent, proceeding on other lines, but not, as I understand, negating the conclusion. It has, indeed, been said that even these British members are tainted too, because they are favourers of Home Rule. But this is not now a question, though you may make it

one, of Home Rule. The claim to Home Rule is made on other grounds. It is an absurd contention (as has been shown by the honourable member for Plymouth, whose sympathetic treatment of our case I gladly acknowledge) that such opinions could vitiate their judgment on this economic question. Then you must, as I submit, give great weight to the conclusions of that body of men, experts, but of like passions with ours, and subject to the same infirmities, who have yet found against you and themselves. It was reached on the evidence of

“SIR ROBERT GIFFEN AND SIR EDWARD HAMILTON AND OTHERS,

great British public servants,—the one the able head of the Treasury, and the other an economist and statistician of high repute, brightened by his display on this occasion. It was reached after collecting, weighing and sifting all information suggested from every quarter and valuing and applying all tests—population, imports and exports, consumption of duty-paid goods, consumption of commodities of primary use, assessment of death duties, assessment of income tax, other incomes and wages, yearly wealth, aggregate production, capital, comparative progress of capacity, relative effects of fiscal policy, and so on, with statistical facts too numerous to name. It was reached after examination of the principles of taxation and their application, including some which made a serious difference amongst us, namely because some of us thought that the gross income was relatively smaller, and that a larger application was needed of the principles of equality of sacrifice, of a deduction of a subsistence allowance, and of the relative taxable weakness of a poor as compared with a wealthy country. Some of us believed, and now believe, that a just application of these principles would show the Irish relative capacity much less, and her taxable surplus almost exhausted, while the British is hardly touched. We saw an Irish surplus over living allowance of perhaps fifteen millions, mainly abstracted by taxation, and a British surplus of perhaps eleven hundred millions less than tithed by taxation. We say Irish relative taxable capacity is steadily diminishing. We thought, in accordance with Sir Robert Giffen, that a far lower proportion would be true, and also that a maximum contribution should be affixed so as to meet

the proved danger of excessively increased expenditure. I quite agree that a rigorous application of these figures and principles is not to be hoped for. It is still true that 'To him that hath shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly; and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.' But a nearer approach should be made; and I hope some day to maintain this view in this place. Meantime, I ask you to remember that this is stated only as a maximum. Sir Edward Hamilton himself, towards the close of the inquiry, put the relation of resources as one twenty-second part, as I understand, from the question of subsistence allowance, and Lord Farrer has lately, in another place, declared his conviction to be that the maximum named is too high. For my present purpose this is enough and more than enough. It so far proves a great disproportion—so far establishes a substantial grievance—so far calls for a remedy. I would only ask you to remember that the contribution of Ireland is between one-eleventh and one-twelfth, or nearly twice her maximum relative taxable capacity, and thus reaches a minimum excess of $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions. As I have said, on the question of precise degree the Commission was divided.

"ALL THE FACTS AND ARGUMENTS ARE NOW BEFORE THE
GOVERNMENT,

which should propose a decision to be settled some other day on broad lines by Parliamentary adjustment and compromise. I cannot then accept this as the only just estimate; I ask you to accept it only as a maximum. Indeed, I am not sure that this proposition is now disputed. It takes me only part of the way in my argument; but I strongly argue that by itself it creates an urgent case for relief on the grounds of fair play and generous consideration due from the strong to the weak. But, sir, the case of Ireland stands higher. It stands upon treaty and justice, equity and right. Ireland has been found by the Commission entitled to separate consideration as a fiscal entity in the question of contribution, and the finding is of weight. This is, however, not a question especially for experts. It is based on historical, legal and equitable considerations peculiarly for the final decision of this House, and I must ask your patience while I briefly state its grounds."

We must consider in this relation an important discussion which took place in the British Parliament, July 18, 1901, on a motion made by Mr. J. J. Clancy, that:

“The overtaxation of Ireland established by the recent Royal Commission on Financial Relations constitutes a serious and pressing grievance as regards that country, and demands the early attention of his Majesty’s Government with a view to its removal.”

It would be impossible to place the latest phase of this subject before the reader in a more intelligible or condensed form than the official debate as reported.¹ The views expressed by the chief speakers among the Irish National members will be given at length. The rebutting remarks made by the Chancellor and others in the interest of the Government will be omitted, as they were but special pleading against the statement of truth which was unanswerable:

“Mr. Clancy said: He wished to present as briefly as possible, and at the same time as fully as the importance of the question demanded, the case that existed for the relief of the over-taxation of Ireland. He hoped that the result of the discussion would be somewhat less unsatisfactory than on former occasions. He recognises that Ireland had gained something from the agitation on this question, but on the whole their grievance had been denied and their demand for relief directly refused. They based their claim first on certain provisions of the Act of Union and in doing that they were not inconsistent, for though opposed to the Union, root and branch, they were not therefore prevented from taking any advantage of it they could for the benefit of Ireland. What were the actual consequences of the system of indiscriminately taxing two countries so dissimilar in other respects as England and Ireland? In 1893-94, the last financial year taken account of by the Royal Commission, the population of Ireland was 4,600,599, and the total imperial taxation was £7,568,649. Since then the population of Ireland had been declining and taxation had been going up, till at the close of the

¹ *Freeman's Journal*, Dublin, July 19, 1901.

Population Decreases ; Taxation Increases 57

last financial year the population was 4,456,546, and the taxation £9,505,000. As the taxation was still increasing it was accurate to assume that it was now larger than in 1893-94 by almost as much as the Royal Commission declared we were then over-taxed in comparison to Great Britain. If it continued it meant for the country the absolute destruction of all sources of wealth and of all chances of industrial development. That was the result of a poor country being financially linked with a richer one, prepared on all occasions to embark on costly enterprises. Who would contend that the poor country would be able to pay supposing this year's ten millions was raised to twelve next year and there could be no limit seen to South African expenditure? What would be the result? He was told that Ireland suffered because she was poor and that there were poor localities in England which suffered equally. He doubted that, because portions of the money were spent in those localities, but if it were so, did two wrongs make a right? The fact was the present system of indiscriminate taxation was a grievance of the first magnitude so far as Ireland was concerned. Apart from the Union altogether they appealed to the letter of the law and the House was bound to take the course he had pointed out at the risk, if it refused, of being guilty of breaking another treaty. Lord Castlereagh, although he dragooned the country, thought it necessary to give to the Irish Legislature the most solemn assurances: 'As to the future it is expected that the two countries shall move forward and unite with regard to their expenses in the measure of their relative ability!' Explaining the 7th Section of the Act of Union he said: 'Ireland has the utmost possible security that she cannot be taxed beyond the measure of her relative ability and the ratio of her contribution must ever correspond with her relative wealth and prosperity.' The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a statement last year, made the extraordinary statement that separate treatment was not the dominant note of the arrangement; but that was exactly what it was. Common treatment was regarded as a remote possibility. Until the conditions of the two countries became similar Ireland was to pay two parts for fifteen by Great Britain to the common expenditure of the empire, and the taxation in Ireland was to be regulated accordingly.

“If that arrangement had been carried out it would have saved Ireland a great deal; but that it was not fair treatment was proved by the fact that the Irish Parliament protested against it. Then after some time it was found that money had to be borrowed and 19 millions was added to the debt of Ireland. Then the Act of 1817 was passed. The Irish debt was fraudulently increased. It was as infamous a proceeding as placing upon her the ten millions paid for crushing the rebellion of '98, which had been fostered and provoked by English statesmen in order to provide an excuse for carrying the Union. The conditions were that the circumstances of the two countries should have become similar. Well, the fact was that the conditions became more dissimilar every year and every penny taken from Ireland since 1817 in excess of the disproportionate distribution according to the Act of that year was wrongfully extracted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the Irish representatives assented. Yes, but those men were elected fifteen or twenty years before the Catholic Emancipation and the majority of them did not represent any one except the persons whom they bribed. It was also said that it was an act of benevolence towards Ireland by England, because Ireland was not able to pay her debts and England took the liabilities upon her own shoulders. It was a strange sort of benevolence. It was said the Irish contribution was not paid, but the truth was that it was hoped by England that it never would be paid, so that there might be a pretext of fleecing Ireland. He (Mr. Clancy) solemnly declared that history did not disclose a more dishonorable series of transactions.

“How had Ireland been treated since 1817? Some effect, no doubt, was given to the terms about separate treatment and till '53 separate treatment was the rule. But that was not an exhibition of British generosity. The truth was that they were unable to get more out of Ireland for the country was impoverished by British policy. The generosity of England to Ireland at this period reminded him of a story of the Munster Bar. A barrister was brought to task for taking a fee of a pound instead of a guinea, and his reply in defence was, ‘My God! sure I took all he had.’ Both parties in England acted the part of plunderers in Ireland. When Ireland was just recovering from the awful effects of the famine her taxation was increased fifty-two per

cent., while that of England was only increased seventeen per cent., though the population of the latter country was advancing by leaps and bounds, while that of Ireland was decreasing. According to the Report of the Financial Relations Commission of '94, Ireland was overtaxed nearly three millions a year more than her taxable capacity justified. The Commission was composed of the highest financial experts and no Commission could possess greater weight in this respect. The first three findings of that Commission were: (1) That the Act of the Union imposed upon Ireland burdens which, as events showed, she was unable to bear; (2) that the increase of taxation laid upon Ireland between 1853 and 1860 was not justified by the circumstances; (3) that whilst the annual taxable revenue of Ireland was about one-eleventh of Great Britain, the relative taxable capacity was very much smaller and not estimated by any of the Commissions as exceeding one-twentieth. Sir Robert Giffen placed it long ago at one fifty-third. He (Mr. Clancy), in considering this matter, preferred to use his eyes and ears, and then judge for himself what Ireland ought to pay as compared with England and when he saw the vast industries of England, when he saw the trade in the Thames and on the Tyne, when he heard of her vast foreign and colonial trade, when he knew of the millions and tens of millions she had in foreign countries, all he could say was, when he turned to the wretched remnant of Irish trade and commerce that the Union had left Ireland, when he saw the roofless warehouses in the West and East and South of Ireland, the idle mills on the banks of Irish streams—there were twenty in his own constituency—he began to suspect that apparently the most reliable statistics were delusive and that even Sir Robert Giffen's figures were too high. The only reply to their demand for redress upon this question was the plea of a set-off, which was a ridiculous and absurd plea. The truth of the whole matter was that England was holding Ireland by force. Every man in Ireland, outside of a few fanatics in the North of Ireland who were honest, was paid for his loyalty.

“ Sir Thomas Esmonde said: ‘It might surprise some honorable members to know that when Ireland had a parliament of her own, she managed to conduct her affairs very satisfactorily indeed. Their management of the financial business was very successful

indeed. The first effect of the Act of Union was the piling up, to an enormous extent, of the Irish National Debt.'

"Coming to the manner in which these provisions (of the Act of Union) were carried out in the period between 1800 and 1817, he showed that: 'Not only did Ireland pay her proper proportion, but that she paid far more than was ever contemplated by the Act of Union. From 1800 to 1817, Ireland paid £68,000,000 for her own charges, and roughly speaking Irish administration before the Union cost only two millions a year, while in the seventeen years after it the average cost was four millions a year. In addition to paying sixty-eight millions for her own charges Ireland paid, in the same period, nearly ninety-two millions towards the cost of the Imperial establishment and policy! . . . Before 1817 Ireland paid one-twelfth of the total Imperial taxation and from 1817 to 1843 she had paid one-sixth. Coming to the third period the income tax was imposed in 1853 and, contrary to the promises given at the time, it became a permanent tax on Ireland. Afterwards certain grants were made to Ireland, but these were grants from Irish funds.'

"Mr. McCann said: It was now seven years since the report of the Commission was published in which it was agreed that Ireland then paid two and a half millions per annum more than she should be called upon to pay. Let them see what had occurred during the seven years that passed since then. For the year ending 31st March, 1894, the last year dealt with by the Commissioners, there was collected and paid into the Imperial Treasury as Irish revenue from taxation the sum of £7,569,000, and in the same year the Treasury claimed to have paid out of this revenue for Irish service £5,602,000 available for Imperial expenditure, for the service of the debt, the Army and Navy. For the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1901, seven years afterwards, the Irish revenue received by the Imperial Treasury from Irish taxation came to £7,268,000, leaving a balance available for Imperial purposes of £2,253,000. In this way it would be seen that Ireland paid last year in taxation just £2,000,000 more than they paid in the year 1894, when she was paying two and a half millions over her just proportion and beyond her taxable capacity compared with Great Britain. It may be said that this additional expenditure for Irish services of £1,665,000 should

be treated, as far as it went, against this additional burden of £2,000,000 of taxation. That would be an answer to some extent if this expenditure on Irish services would be spent in any reproductive ways towards strengthening and improving in any permanent manner the country and the condition of the people and their tax-paying capacity. He could not trace any portion of it as spent in this direction, nor, indeed, could any portion of the total amount put down as spent on Irish services, which amounted to £7,268,000, be traced as spent in permanent reproductive ways nor could he see that any part of the amount Ireland contributed (£2,253,000) for Imperial purposes was employed for her good, or for the betterment of the material condition of the country in any lasting manner. What he meant was that no portion of this huge taxation extracted from Ireland last year—£9,500,000 in all—was spent in any way towards keeping any young man or woman from emigration or keeping a pauper off the rates, nor was it employed in bettering the position of those who have not left the country, or who were not yet a burden on the poor rates. The proof of his assertion was that in face of the fall in the population to under four and a half millions, pauperism was increasing and weakness and paralysis, physical, mental and financial, was the fate of those who remained in the country, and were now too old to leave. On the present lines of the Government's fiscal and economic policy in Ireland, it was fair to assume, indeed it was a certainty, that this state of things must become intensified as time went on. He might be told, however, that £7,268,000 was spent in Ireland, although perhaps no portion was made available for the purposes he had named. If that answer was examined it would be found that except as regards the whiskey and porter which the Irish people consumed, nearly all requisites of life—the bread they ate, the clothes they wore, the furniture for their houses, etc., were produced and manufactured outside of Ireland. So, to all intents and purposes, as far as the good of Ireland is concerned, this money so expended, as well as other expenditure, might just as well be expended in England or Scotland direct. The question was: if such an amount must be raised by taxation, was it equitably assessed and its incidence just? The first point that strikes one in that connection was this, that just eighty per cent. of Ireland's taxation was derivable from

duties on commodities, otherwise indirect taxation, whilst only fifty per cent. was levied on commodities in England. The great and unjust burden of Irish taxation was being carried at present by the Irish peasantry and this has been the case during the whole of the preceding century, which closed a few months ago. The amount of taxation paid by Ireland during the last fifteen years preceding the Union was just about one and a half millions per annum, and the total for these fifteen years came to £22,500,000. For the first sixteen years of the century, under the terms of partnership with Great Britain, Ireland was found to be liable for £160,000,000 or just £10,000,000 a year, of which only about half could be raised and the remaining half being added to the debt gave the pretext for the abolition of a separate Irish Exchequer and the imposition of common and indiscriminate taxation, so that during the first sixteen years of the Union Ireland became liable to pay seven times more than she had been paying before; and she actually did pay in hard cash more than three times the amount she had been paying before the partnership was entered into. Yet he could trace none of this huge increase of taxation as being applied in any way towards improving the Imperial condition of the country or strengthening in any way the tax-paying powers of the wretched peasantry on whom falls the great injustice of this excessive taxation. The same had been the case during the entire century which ended a few months ago, but he considered that the injustice done to this class and through them to the community as a whole, existed to-day to a greater extent and in a more intensified form than at any other time during the century past. With the additional taxes put on for the current year it was reasonable to assume that Ireland's taxation would come to a sum well over £10,000,000 to 31st March next year, that is, if it could possibly be squeezed out of the people. This, with about £3,000,000 additional for local taxation payable to county councils, would work out to £13,000,000 as the tax revenue of Ireland for the current year, as compared with £1,500,000 a year during the last fifteen years of her own Parliament, or nearly nine times greater. Her population now was about the same as then—four and a half millions—so that it worked out that she was now paying about £2 18s. per head of the population in taxation, whereas then she was paying

only 6*s.* 8*d.* per head. Had anything been done practically to strengthen or improve the tax-paying ability to pay these increased burdens? On the contrary, there had been a serious weakening of powers in this respect. Since the Financial Relations Report was issued there emigrated from Ireland, chiefly to the United States, to settle permanently abroad, just 275,000 people, young men and young women at the age of about twenty-two years. It cost about £9 a year to feed and clothe an Irish workhouse pauper. This rate would work out about £200 capital sunk in each emigrant up to twenty-two years of age. Making allowance for the value of some work which the young emigrants might do before they leave Ireland and also some little money they might send home to their people afterwards, he thought it would be found that the net money loss in capital to Ireland, sunk and lost in each emigrant, will be at least £100 each, meaning a loss in capital in Ireland during these seven years of just £27,500,000. Putting four per cent. interest on this lost capital the loss comes to over £1,000,000 annually, which he considered he was entitled to add to the £2,000,000 a year of increased taxation since 1894, making the drain £3,000,000 a year in addition to the unjust taxation of two and a half millions as found by the Financial Relations Commissioners in the year 1894. The question arose, on whom did the terrible drain fall most severely? It fell on the Irish peasantry, the most numerous and poorest class, whom it ought to be the interest of every one to preserve, but whose material interests were constantly and consistently kept out of sight. The Irish problem centred in the material condition of these poor people. It was computed that these peasantry, say 2,000,000 in all, pay £1 to 1£ 5*s.* per head per annum towards Imperial taxation in their consumption of tea, sugar, tobacco, porter and whiskey; their local taxation comes to about half the Imperial, or about 10*s.* to 12*s.* 6*d.* per head. It may be said—why do these people consume these dutiable articles when they are not necessities? He thought the best answer to this question was given by Lord Farrer, Lord Welby, and Mr. Bertram Currie in their report. They say: ‘We think that the consumption of the masses must be taken as a whole and that we must accept what they actually consume as what they find it necessary to consume, and that, without a total and almost incurable change in their habits

they are unable to forego.' He believed that the use of stimulants among the Irish peasantry and poor was very much the result of their low standard of living and their coarse and insufficient food and clothing, and, in a measure, of climatic influences and the uncertainty of their material existence. They in Ireland had been frequently asked by the predominant partner since the issue of the Financial Relations Report to point out where the grievances lay in our overtaxation as compared with England and to show what class was hit and then to suggest some practical remedies. . . . The grievance lies almost wholly with their 2,000,000 of operative peasantry, whose income, even in their good years, was not more than £5 a head of their families. Compare this class with the operative artisan class in England or Scotland; it would be found that their incomes were three times greater than the same class in Ireland. If so, their ability to bear taxation was ten times greater. Ireland was over-boarded and under-fed and the cost of over-boarding was paid by the under-fed. Transit rates and facilities were absolutely prohibitive in enabling the small operative producers, four-fifths of the whole tenant class in Ireland, to market their produce at a profit. Every other agricultural country in the world except Ireland was straining every nerve, both by their railways and waterways and every other means, to facilitate and cheapen the marketings of agricultural produce direct to the consumers, both in their own country and to the countries to which they could possibly get access and open up new markets.

"Every force and influence, governmental and otherwise, seem set in the opposite direction in Ireland. Transit rates in Ireland are, he believed, the highest in the world and the foreigner had rates made for him by the Irish carrying companies very much lower than the rates charged to the Irish producer for the same or analogous produce. He would only say, in conclusion, that his belief was that Ireland should be run for £5,000,000 a year in tax revenue instead of £13,000,000 a year, as at present. This £5,000,000 a year would be nearly three and a half times more than the amount expended in running the country during the last fifteen years of the Irish Parliament. His belief also was that if the Irish railways and waterways were locally nationalized and that fifty per cent. were taken off all transit rates, passengers,

goods, coal, agricultural produce, and especially low rates and facilities were given for the conveyance of small consignments of agricultural and other produce to the markets—he believed if this were done under proper economical management that £1 an acre would be the additional value of Irish land before many years elapsed. In this way, by increasing the income and decreasing the expenditure of the country, he calculated that £15,000,000 to £20,000,000 a year might be added to the wealth of the country in the space of ten or fifteen years. He estimated that the immediate loss by the reduction of railway rates would be £7,000,000 to £8,000,000, spread over a period of ten years, or an average loss of £800,000 per annum, then a profit would accrue to the State after the payment of working expenses and the interest and sinking fund for purchase money. The benefit derivable from the decrease in expenditure and increase in income would accrue first to the peasantry and then through them these benefits would permeate through every class of society. The whole difficulty heretofore had been the fact that the predominant partner had insisted upon looking upon and treating the economics of the Irish problem in the same way as in England, whereas, from every industrial and economic point of view they are totally dissimilar.

“Mr. T. W. Russell (a Union member from Ulster) said: Not only was it clear that by the Act of the Union separate treatment was laid down for Ireland, but as a matter of fact the treatment was retained up to 1853, when the income tax and the higher spirit duty came into force. He (Mr. Russell) had never before taken part in that House in a Financial Relations debate because he was muzzled, but historically he agreed with the Irish party opposite. Practically he saw insuperable difficulties in the way of some of the proposals made for the settlement of the question. The English case, in his opinion, was an impossible case. The Government allowed the verdict against them to stand, and as long as it stood the plea of ‘Not Guilty’ was of no avail.

“In no transaction of a financial character between two countries had the poorer country ever got the better. The two grants—one to the Maynooth and the other to the Presbyterian ministers—were shifted from the Consolidated Fund and placed on the Irish Church Fund. That was another sample of how Ireland was

'done' in her financial deals with England. The doctrine of relative taxable capacity was met by the doctrine of indiscriminate taxation and the advocates of the latter said Ireland was properly placed on the same footing as Gloucestershire or Wiltshire. But Ireland before the Union was a distinct entity. He held that the case of Ireland could not be resisted on historical grounds. . . . Let the Government set aside every year from the Imperial Exchequer a certain sum for public utility purposes in Ireland and meet the difficulty in that way. . . . Many English members were bothering their heads about over-representation of Ireland. Let them instead devote their attention to the over-taxation of Ireland.

"Mr. T. P. O'Connor said there was no price which the Irish people could be offered for which they would be willing to sacrifice their political convictions and, as to the historical argument, he would duly say that in his opinion no man who would read the words of the Act of the Union and the speeches of men who promoted and passed it, would doubt that a separate fiscal system was intended for Ireland. The Chancellor wondered they based their case upon that Act. Well, he could tell him that the movement was not at an end. It might be doubted if it was fully commenced, but the right honorable gentleman might make up his mind that he had to deal on this subject with a practically united Ireland. Dealing with a set-off he (Mr. O'Connor) said his answer was now of the expenditure that could be regarded as other than imperial, in fact, he might almost say, that was other than injurious. In the able speech of the member who had dealt with this part of the subject (Mr. McCann), a man of business, it was pointed out that this so-called contribution of the Empire to the taxation of Ireland had done no good to the two millions of people who lived on small holdings. It was, in fact, Imperial expenditure. He asked, was it not a mockery and an insult for the right honorable gentleman, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to put the extravagant and bloated Irish administration, bloated and extravagant and for the purposes of corruption, as a set-off against the National claim? What did the Lord Lieutenant say of the prosperity of Ireland? Speaking in Dublin this year, the Lord Lieutenant said: 'The fact is that, with all the industries abolished, with mills lying idle and in ruins and of all the destruc-

tion of vital energy in the towns, brought about by many years of misgovernment in the past, there is really nothing to draw away the surplus population of the congested districts of Ireland.' There is the picture of Ireland, drawn, not by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has not been there for years, but by the Lord Lieutenant of the day. Let them contrast that picture with the picture of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech. He (Mr. O'Connor) would say in conclusion that, except the massacre of the Armenians in the face of silent and cowardly Europe, there is no more tragic spectacle in the world to-day than the sight of this great country seeing a poor country like Ireland wasting and decaying, yet still proclaiming that all is well in Ireland; and that, while they knew that the country was fast descending to the vortex of bankruptcy and despair."

After some further discussion the House then divided and as usual, even with the most important affairs relating to Ireland unless it were a Coercion Act, Parliament refused to consider at length Mr. Clancy's motion by a vote of 102 against 224 for the Government.

The census reports, as published by the British Government for the last decade of the nineteenth century, clearly show the effect of the hand of English rule in Ireland.

While some of the facts have been cited elsewhere, placing them together in this connection will be advantageous. The Irish Press has been found by the writer always accurate in statements relating to this subject so that the following facts thus obtained can be relied upon.

"The census report for Ireland shows that the total population is 4,456,775, a total decline of 5.23 per cent. during the decade. The emigrants during the ten years numbered 430,993.

"Turning to the agricultural statistics we find no less lamentable a story. The following figures may safely be allowed to speak for themselves.

"In 1901 the total amount of land under crops was 4,631,051 acres, as against 4,818,381 acres in 1891. During the decade grass land increased from 10,298,654 acres to 10,577,238 acres. Woods and plantations decreased from 311,554 acres to 309,741

acres; and turf bog, marsh, mountain, etc., decreased from 4,769,677 acres to 4,710,162 acres. The land under cereal crops decreased from 1,492,763 acres to 1,317,576 acres; green crops from 1,191,426 acres to 1,079,445 acres, and flax from 74,655 acres to 5,442 acres. Only meadow and clover lands increased from 2,059,529 acres to 2,178,592 acres.

“In ten years 187,330 acres of land have gone out of cultivation. Divided into farms of 30 acres, able to support comfortably a family each, we find that great tracts of rich land—none else would feed King Bos—which would under a proper system of government maintain 6,244 families—and, giving each family an average of four persons, that would mean 24,976 people—all this immense tract of land has been allowed to fall into a condition in which it is of no earthly use in developing the prosperity of the country.

“Then the grass lands pure and simple have increased at an alarming rate. In ten years the huge total of 278,580 acres have been added to the dominions ranged over by the bullocks and sheep. The total number of acres devoted to grazing at the present moment is considerably over ten millions and a half.”

By these figures it is shown that not more than one-third of all the arable land of Ireland is at the present time available for agricultural purposes, while but a small portion of this area would under present circumstances be within the means of the vast majority of the Irish people. It is to change this condition that the United Irish League was organized and is most active in its good work.

The stranger passing through Ireland sees but little of her poverty-stricken people, as the route of travel is through that portion held chiefly by those of a privileged class who have always been prosperous. Year after year the most elaborate and attractive works are published under Government influence to show the increasing prosperity of Ireland. Their statements are consistent with the truth, for in no other country are the people more prosperous than those in Ireland who have prospered at the expense of the many;

“Irish Industries” No Benefit to Peasantry 69

and nowhere else are the poor and the majority of the people relatively in greater poverty.

Those who prosper spend to a great extent their means out of the country or for foreign products and in the same direction passes the yearly produce of the soil; nothing remaining behind but the increasing poverty of the Irish people proper.

It is not exaggeration to assert that the needy portion of the Irish people at large derive more benefit from the pennies of the tourist than profit from the so-called Irish industries conducted, as they usually are, for the sole advantage of the foreign element which has in the past garrisoned Ireland in England's interests. In Donegal and in a few other instances known to the author, the natives were instructed in certain industries, as their labor was needed, and these, it is true, earned thereby enough to maintain themselves for the time being; but the profits from these industries passed into the hands of those who advanced the capital, who live for the most part abroad, and little of it remains in circulation in Ireland. Wherever a source of profit presents itself at the present day, the Scotch or English capitalist in Ireland generally fills every wage-earning position, even to the most menial, with his own countrymen to the exclusion of the native Irish.

The effects of the atrocious Penal laws by which England crushed the people, as we have shown, for over two hundred years still bind Ireland in chains even at the present day. Because she was not permitted in the past to pursue any business occupation or take part in the gradual development of modern trade and finance, the majority of her native race is to-day without business training beyond shop-keeping in a small way and a very limited cultivation of the soil. Is it then possible that a revival of prosperity can ever result from their own efforts, under present conditions? If, owing to some future cause or circumstance, whose horoscope is invisible to-day, an opportunity for prosperity should again present itself to Ireland, could the native Irish seize upon

it and develop it without capital? Even with Home Rule, or partial self-government, is it not certain that with the first dawn of prosperity Ireland would be over-run by a horde of implacable and greedy foreigners, as was the Transvaal, with no interest or heart in the country beyond the exploitation of themselves and their personal gain? Thus again in a short time, as in the past, alien races would absorb the entire country or all of value in it which once was and still should be the portion of the Celt.

There would then result an economic condition more direful than the present or even than that of the past, for the Irish as a nation would disappear before an irresistible force, together with every vestige of their language and every characteristic of the Celtic race. Then would England's dream be realized when Ireland became, save in name, an English or Scotch province!

It is hard to see what the future holds for Ireland as the land of the Irish, unless the Land Question can be quickly settled in such manner that it shall really benefit the majority or poorer portion of the population and unless the nation, at the same time, acquire such a measure of Home Rule that it can authoritatively protect itself and hold the country and its industries *for the benefit of the native Irish alone* whether, as individuals, they be of Celtic or foreign origin.

The hour has now come—if, alas! it be not passed—when if Ireland shall exist and still remain a part of the British Empire, the selfish and opposing interests of England must cease to be a factor for consideration.

The only portion of these people who can have any hope for the future under the present administration of Irish affairs are those who have been settled on good land with the prospect of future ownership. And even so much has been gained only through the indomitable energy of the Irish National leaders who have thus forced, by their activity, the members of the Land Commission to make some effort in the discharge of their duties.

CHAPTER V

ENGLAND'S INJUSTICE TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND— BIGOTRY IN OPPOSITION TO A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

SHORTLY after the death of Queen Victoria, Mr. John Redmond, Chairman of the Irish National Members of Parliament, in a speech delivered at Wexford, Ireland, made the following statement:

“ The reign which has just come to a close has been for Ireland and the Irish race more disastrous than any other English reign for three hundred years. During that reign close on one million and a half of our people died of famine. Four millions of our people during the reign have emigrated to other lands. Four million evictions have taken place during the reign, and there have been under the sway of this monarch—who, as far as England and her colonies are concerned, will be regarded as a great constitutional monarch—there have been *over forty coercion acts passed for this country*, and each one of them deprived Ireland of those constitutional rights without which there would be no loyalty to the throne to-day in England or in her Colonies.”

What a farce, then, was the jubilee, held at the completion of the sixtieth year of the reign of her late Majesty, to any one familiar with the real conditions existing in Ireland during Queen Victoria's reign!

Ireland had lost, as we have shown, more than half her population in direct consequence of misgovernment; she had been reduced to poverty and England held a “jubilee” to emphasize her own prosperity which had been gained, to a great extent, by robbing Ireland during the past

hundred years of nearly everything which could be transported out of that country.

The average English mind is dull in seeing quickly a joke; but a very grim one it would have been if, under the circumstances, the Irish people had seemed to participate with any enthusiasm in the English Jubilee.

The late Queen, in common with her ancestors the Georges, held the same feelings of hatred and contempt for the Irish people. During her reign of sixty years—one of indifference to the welfare of the Irish people—she spent fifteen whole days or, if the portion of the day of her arrival and that of her departure be counted, seventeen days in Ireland until within a year of her death!¹ And, with the exception of the few hours she was present at the public ceremonies in opening Queenstown, the greater portion of her visit was spent on the west coast in a most secluded and thinly populated section of the country.

By means of the recent publication of the Queen's correspondence with the late Lord Tennyson that was proved which had been suspected was a fact, namely, that no Tory in England nor Orangeman in Ulster was more bitterly opposed than she to the granting of Home Rule to Ireland. In justice to her it must be stated that she had been remarkably circumspect in the past and that her private opinion was never known regarding a public measure while it was under consideration. It therefore becomes all the more significant, by this exception, what her purpose was in letting her views be known regarding the Home Rule Bill which had passed the House of Commons with Mr. Gladstone's approval. Her opposition, even if personal influence was not used, necessarily had weight with the House of Lords in defeating the passage of the measure to which it was known she was unwilling to give her approval. It is then not remarkable that only those in sympathy with England

¹ Her late visit to Ireland, for the purpose of recruiting her army with Irishmen to fight the Boers, which signally failed in its object, would add a few days more to the total.

and English interests in Ireland could take part in the Queen's Jubilee.

Owing to emigration and a chronic state of suffering, due to an insufficient amount as well as the proper kind of food, the population of Ireland has not only diminished but consists of an unusually large proportion of aged persons with consequently a smaller proportion of children.

But above all the other disadvantages from which Ireland is at present suffering is the great decrease in the value of land. This is her only available property, yet in the past ten years there has been a loss in value of at least one-half. Therefore, unless some change can be brought about and unless it be accomplished within the near future, both landlord and tenant must become involved in common ruin. The unlooked-for is, however, always coming into view and the least expected event is often the one to happen. And so for the present prospect! So far as we can look into the future it seems as if Home Rule for Ireland, in some form, is nearer being a possibility, from necessity on the part of the English Government, than at any time since the beginning of the movement. The "Local Government Bill" rendered possible the complete organization of the United Irish League movement, by means of which the Irish people are again united in a common purpose and to an extent that has never existed before. And with them lies the balance of power in the British Parliament to be used when the opportunity occurs!

Recently the British Parliament refused to grant a university to the Catholics of Ireland and in a previous chapter this instance was cited in proof of the still-existing bigotry of the Orangemen of Ulster, who have so long directed the English policy in relation to the Irish Catholics. We have had under consideration ample evidence of England's injustice to Ireland and we cannot close this chapter with a more appropriate illustration than a brief consideration of the last act which gives the fullest indication of the same old vindictive spirit of intolerance.

Trinity College, Dublin, was established by the Catholics during the reign of Henry VIII., about the time that monarch received the title "Defender of the Faith" from Pope Leo X. for his able defence of the Church against Luther and his claims.¹ During Queen Elizabeth's reign Trinity College was seized from the Catholics and most liberally endowed with confiscated Catholic property, which it has continued to enjoy to the present time in the interests of the Church of England.

Within a few years past a university has been established by the Government in the north and another in the west of Ireland, one for the Presbyterians and another for the Methodists, and both have been most liberally endowed with money raised on Irish taxation; yet the Catholics are refused the same advantages! It is now claimed that there is no necessity for another university in Ireland!

The propriety was admitted without question that the Presbyterians and Methodists as dissenters could not be expected to conform to the course at Trinity College, Dublin, under the Church of England; yet with strange inconsistency it is now held that the Catholics should do so!

In a public address made at the opening of the present century and printed in the Dublin Press, Judge Webb, an official of the University of Dublin of which Trinity College is the chief feature, is reported by the Press to have expressed himself in the following manner:

"Our University was founded by Protestants, for Protestants, and in the Protestant interest. A Protestant spirit had from the first animated every member of the body corporate. At the present moment, with all its toleration, all its liberality, all its comprehensiveness and all its scrupulous honor, the *genus loci*,

¹ In this unanswerable defence, Henry maintained: "If the tree may be known by its fruit, the pride and passion, the lust and debauchery of the new apostle, prove that he had received no communion from God." But this view of the case was expressed before Henry had developed his own uxorious zeal! The title of the work was *Assertio VII. Sacramentorum adversus Lutherum*, London, 1521.

the guardian spirit of the place, is Protestant. And as a Protestant I for one say, and say it boldly, Protestant may it ever remain."

This declaration, if it means anything, is not tolerant and it shows that Judge Webb was wanting too much in the true spirit of charity to be able to comprehend what the terms "toleration" and "liberality" imply. At the present period he cannot be openly intolerant to the degree of persecution, which we fear he would assuredly advocate under favorable circumstances. He, however, deserves credit for the courage of his convictions as an Orangeman.

No practical Catholic could in conscience accept an "unsectarian" education based on the terms of "tolerance" and "liberality" with "its scrupulous honor," offered by Trinity College; nor in fact from any other Protestant University in the country. Irish Protestantism is, in connection with education, the most intolerant towards Catholics owing to an assumed superiority based on stupid bigotry and vindictiveness, a natural enough collocation in the absence of the *one thing* essential to the existence of true Christianity.

This question of a university has been ably presented by different writers in the Catholic interest. The following brief summary is to the point and was taken from a newspaper clipping by an unknown writer; unfortunately the preceding portion of it was mislaid or lost:

"Let me sum up, the members of the Disestablished (Protestant) Church of Ireland, numbering half a million, have the enjoyment of a University with an endowment of between thirty and forty thousand pounds. The Presbyterians, who stand with Catholics as one to eight, have their denominational University at Belfast, with a State endowment of upwards of ten thousand pounds a year. The Catholics of Ireland number upwards of four million and have no University. But one reason can be assigned for this humiliating and degrading exclusion—their fidelity to their ancestral religion. For forty years have the Catholics of Ireland been agitating for the removal of this grievance. They

ask for no favor, no privilege, no sop. They do not ask that Trinity College nor any of the Queen's colleges should be despoiled to enrich them. They ask for equality, nothing more; nor will they be content with anything less; and equality means two things—equality as to endowment, and equality as to academic status. If it is just and reasonable that *one million Protestants* in Ireland should have endowments from the Government of between *sixty and seventy thousand pounds a year*, it surely cannot be reasonable or just that *four millions of Catholics should have nothing.*"

It may be stated in addition that the injustice to the Catholics is aggravated, because they are taxed to a greater degree to pay these endowments; for the English Government has never spent, even for supposed charity, a penny in Ireland from its own resources without exacting repayment through increase of taxes. The average prosperity may be greater among a proportion of Protestants but the Catholics in Ireland as a whole pay a greater portion of the taxes, directly or indirectly, owing to their numbers.

A zealous clergyman of the Church of England, the Rev. Malcolm MacColl, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Ripon, states, in an "Introductory Letter" to his work¹ addressed to Sir Wm. Harcourt, the following:

"Home Rule being for the present in abeyance, there is all the more reason why the Imperial Parliament should prove to Ireland that it is not only willing but zealous to give Ireland equal justice. Has Ireland equal justice in the matter of higher education? I answer emphatically 'no'; and I repudiate the shallow sophistry which would persuade us that the Roman Catholics of Ireland have equal justice because they can avail themselves of the education offered them in colleges not belonging to their own communion. Would Protestants who urge that argument agree to have their children educated in Roman Catholic colleges even in secular subjects? Would they not object that in history, philosophy, logic, ethics, physical sciences, anthropology, a Roman Catholic

¹ *The Reformation Settlement Examined in the Light of History and Law*, London, 1899, pp. xxiii.—xxxv.

lecturer or professor could hardly avoid sometimes giving a theological bias to his instructions? And is it justice to be scrupulous towards the Protestant conscience and brutally indifferent towards the scruples of the Roman Catholic conscience? How hard it is to do unto others as we would have them to do to us! In truth, the Protestant conscience, as represented by the Orange faction, the 'Junto,' as Burke, with scornful indignation called it, has been the curse of Ireland.

" 'All the evils of Ireland originated within itself. . . . English Government has farmed out Ireland, without the reservation of a pepper corn in power or influence, public or individual, to the little narrow faction that domineers there. *Through that alone they see, feel, hear, or understand everything relative to that Kingdom. Nor do they in any way interfere that I know of, except in giving their countenance and the sanction of their name to whatever is done by that Junto.*' "

"Is justice a geographical expression? I have always thought it my duty to apply my doctrine of justice all around: to the Christians of Turkey certainly, but not less certainly to unjust wars against Zulus or Afghans" (we may now add the Transvaal and the Orange Free State) "or the denial of just rights to Indian Mussulmans. And am I to draw the line at the Irish Channel, and deny to the Roman Catholics of Ireland what I would concede to the natives of India? We do not think that our Christianity is at stake because we respect the revenues of Buddhist and Mohammedan institutions in India and Ceylon; yet the cry of 'Protestantism in danger' has been raised whenever it has been proposed to sanction—yes, even without a farthing of Imperial taxes—a Roman Catholic University in Ireland. Lord Palmerston made an attempt to grant a bare charter to a Roman Catholic University in Dublin, and even that slight boon was defeated by the purblind Protestantism of Great Britain and Ulster.

"But, like the Sibyl's books, the demands of Ireland have always arisen with each foolish repulse: and now Ireland demands not only a charter for a Roman Catholic University, but some provision for the maintenance of its staff. A just demand, as it seems to me. But leading Nonconformists denounce the proposal, and blandly tell the Roman Catholics of Ireland that

¹ *Burke on Irish Affairs*, edited by Mr. Matthew Arnold, pp. 376-423.

they are welcome to their University, but they must pay for it out of their own pockets, and not expect the British taxpayers to contribute a farthing towards it. Yet I do not find that these Protestant zealots object to the imposition of taxes, for the maintenance of School Boards, on the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom.

“But there is another answer, and to my mind a more potent one. This is not a question of justice, but of reparation to Ireland. It is to English tyranny and bigotry that Ireland owes her financial ruin and educational poverty. Let me recall the means by which the economic ruin of Ireland was brought about, in the language of two men of great eminence—one of them a Protestant Irishman of distinguished public service: the other an Englishman who has certainly given the Irish Roman Catholics no cause to love him. In a pamphlet published in 1867 by the late Lord Dufferin he wrote as follows¹:

“‘From Queen Elizabeth’s reign until the Union the various commercial confraternities of Great Britain never for a moment relaxed their relentless grip on the trades of Ireland. One by one, each of our nascent industries was either strangled in its birth, or handed over, gagged and bound, to the jealous custody of the rival interests in England, until at last every fountain of wealth was hermetically sealed, and even the traditions of commercial enterprise have perished through desuetude.

“‘The owners of England’s pastures had the honour of opening the campaign. As early as the commencement of the sixteenth century the beeves of Roscommon, Tipperary, and Queen’s County undersold the produce of the English grass countries in their own market. By an Act of the 20th Elizabeth, Irish cattle were declared “a nuisance” and their importation prohibited. Forbidden to send our beasts alive across the Channel, we killed them at home, and begun to supply the sister country with cured provisions. A second Act of Parliament imposed prohibitory duties on salted meats. The hides of the animals still remained: but the same influence put a stop to the importation of leather. Our cattle trade abolished, we tried sheep-farming. The sheep-

¹ This subject has already been treated of at some length but the reader will derive both pleasure and profit from Lord Dufferin’s presentation of the subject.

breeders of England immediately took alarm, and Irish wool was declared contraband by Charles II. Heading in this direction, we tried to work up the raw materials at home: but this created the greatest outcry of all. Every maker of fustian, flannel and broadcloth in the country rose up in arms, and by an Act of William III. the woollen industry of Ireland was extinguished, and 20,000 manufacturers left the Island.¹ The easiness of the Irish labour market and the cheapness of provisions still giving us an advantage, even though we had to import our materials, we next made a dash at the silk business: but the English "silk manufacturers, the sugar refiner, the soap and candle maker (who especially dreaded the abundance of our kelp), and every other trade or interest that thought it worth its while to petition, was received by Parliament with the same partial cordiality, until the most searching scrutiny failed to detect a single vent through which it was possible for the hated industry of Ireland to respire. But, although excluded from the markets of Great Britain, a hundred harbours gave her access to the universal sea. Alas! a rival commerce on her own element was still less welcome to England, and as early as the reign of Charles II. the Levant, the ports of Europe, and the oceans beyond the Cape of Good Hope were forbidden to the flag of Ireland. The colonial trade alone was in any manner open, if that can be called an open trade which for a long time precluded all exports whatever and excluded from direct importation to Ireland such important articles as sugar, cotton and tobacco. What has been the consequence of such a system, pursued with relentless pertinacity for 250 years? This—that, *debarred from every other trade and industry*, the entire nation flung itself back upon the *land* with as fatal an impulse as when a river whose current is suddenly impeded rolls back and drowns the valley it once fertilized.' "

Mr. Froude shall continue the citation²:

"With their shipping destroyed by the Navigation Act, their woollen manufactories taken from them, their trade in all its

¹ "Scotch-Irish" who emigrated to France, as we have shown.

² *The English in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 439.

branches crippled and confined, the single resource left to those of the Irish who still nourished dreams of improving their unfortunate country, was agriculture. The soil was at least their own, which needed only to be drained, cleared of weeds, and manured, to produce grass crops and corn crops as rich as the best in England. Here was employment for a population three times more numerous, than as yet existed. Here was a prospect, if not of commercial wealth, yet of substantial comfort and material abundance."

Mr. MacColl continues:

"But alas! the English garrison in Ireland, with a blind infatuation, completed the industrial ruin which the English Parliament began. Mr. Froude proceeds:

" 'The tenants were forbidden in their leases to break or plough the soil. The people, no longer employed, were driven into holes and corners, and eked out a wretched existence by potato gardens, or by keeping starving cattle of their own on the neglected bogs.'

"Nor did the ingenuity of English misrule, inspired and fostered by the Ulster Junto, end there. It had in its armoury a subtler engine still for compassing the ruin of Ireland. It was not enough to starve the body: the mind, too, must be starved, lest it should dream of freedom and hope for better things. Let me give one illustration, again in the language of 'Burke's terrible indictment.' After touching on the importance of education as an instrument of civil government, and dwelling on the exclusion of the Roman Catholics of Ireland from all avenues of public instruction, Burke proceeds:

" 'Lest they should be enabled to supply this defect by private academies and schools of their own, the law has armed itself with all its terrors against such a practice. Papist schoolmasters of every species are proscribed by those Acts, and it is made felony to teach even in a private family: so that Papists are entirely excluded from all education in any of our authorized establishments for learning at home. In order to shut up every avenue of instruction, the Act of King William in Ireland had added to this restraint by precluding them from all foreign education. This

Act is worthy of attention, on account of the singularity of its provisions. Being sent for education to any public school or college abroad, upon conviction, incurs (if the party sent had any estate of inheritance) a kind of unalterable and perpetual outlawry. The tender and incapable age of such a person, his natural subjection to the will of others, his necessary, unavoidable ignorance of the laws, stand for nothing in his favour. He is disabled to sue in law and equity: to be guardian, executor, or administrator: he is rendered incapable of any legacy or deed of gift; he forfeits all his goods and chattels forever: and he forfeits for his life all his lands, hereditaments, offices, and estates of freehold, and all trusts, powers or interests therein. All persons concerned in sending them or maintaining them abroad, by the least assistance of money or otherwise, are involved in the same disabilities, and subjected to the same penalties.' "

In continuation of the subject Mr. MacColl states (page xxx.):

"Any one unversed in the history of Ireland might naturally suppose that this would have sufficed to reduce the Roman Catholics of Ireland to a state of barbarous servitude. But the resources of tyranny are not so easily exhausted. There was one more instrument of torture in the arsenal of the Junto to break the hearts of the Irish people. Laws were made for the very purpose of dividing Roman Catholic households into dens of internecine hatred and strife; children were set against their parents, wives against their husbands.

" 'The dominion of children over their parents,' says Burke, 'was extended universally throughout the whole Papist part of Ireland.' A child, even a minor, on informing against his father as a Papist, and proclaiming himself a Protestant, could dispossess his father and enter on his inheritance. And this could be repeated *ad libitum* in the event of the father inheriting or acquiring fresh property. So that as Burke observes:

" 'The Act expressly provides that he shall have no respite from the persecution of his children but by totally abandoning all thoughts of improvement and acquisition. This is going a great way surely, but the laws in question have gone much

farther. Not satisfied with calling upon children to revolt against their parents, and to possess themselves of their substance, there are cases where the withdrawing of the child from his father's obedience is not left to the option of the child himself: for if the wife of a Roman Catholic should choose to change her religion, from that moment she deprives her husband of all management and direction of his children, and even all the tender satisfaction which a parent can feel in their society, and which is the only indemnification he can have for all his cares and sorrows: and they are to be torn forever at the earliest age from his house and family; for the Lord Chancellor is not only authorized, but he is strongly required, to take away all his children from such Popish parent, to appoint where, and in what manner, and by whom they are to be educated: and the father is compelled to pay, not for the ransom, but for the deprivation of his children, and to furnish such a sum as the Chancellor thinks proper to appoint for their education to the age of eighteen years. The case is the same should the husband be the conformist.' ¹

“ Well may Mr. Matthew Arnold speak of ‘ that penal code, of which the monstrosity is not half known to Englishmen, and may be studied by them with profit.’ Could the ingenuity of man have invented a system better calculated to confuse the colours of good and evil, to undermine the foundation of morality, to make the sacred name of religion a weapon for destroying family life and polluting the sanctities of home, to dissolve the bonds of civil society, to render the very name of English law hateful in Ireland, and to turn the gentry of Ireland into improvident spendthrifts? And this awful persecution, on which the Spanish Inquisition would find it hard to improve, existed when a few persons still living were born. Yet men who consider themselves humane and enlightened Protestants imagine that they are acting generously and magnanimously when they say if the Irish Roman Catholics want a University they are welcome to it—it is not long since even that boon was denied them—but they must pay for it out of their own pockets—out of the material and intellectual penury, that is, which Anglo-Ulster Protestantism inflicted upon them! Can it be that those who reason thus have indeed read the history of Ireland? Can it be that they are really opposed

¹ Arnold's edition of *Burke on Irish Affairs*, chap. i.

to Home Rule if they have? For of all the arguments for Home Rule none surely can be more effective than an argument founded on our refusal, after all that has passed, to offer a helping hand to the Roman Catholics of Ireland in building up the educational system of which we, with more than Machiavellian craft, deprived them.

“ But bigotry is always stupid, and its stupidity takes many forms. Not only do the opponents of Home Rule undermine their case in resisting all offers of State aid to the establishment of a University for Irish Roman Catholics, but they are thereby doing their best to cherish and perpetuate the very characteristics which they allege as the justification of their alarm against the grants of increased power to the Irish priesthood. A university education would tend inevitably to diminish instead of increasing, the power of priesthood, in the sense in which it is objectionable. The seminarist must of necessity be more narrow-minded and less liberal than the man of University education. . . . Why have the Roman Catholic clergy of Germany and Austria-Hungary held their own with so much credit and distinction among the laity but because they have frequented the same seats of learning as the laity? The Irish bishops, I understand, are ready to make the most liberal concessions to English prepossessions, and even to English prejudice. They are willing, among other things, that the professional staff of their University shall consist predominantly, if not exclusively of laymen. It is hardly credible that a proposal which is commended by the most elementary conceptions of justice and of reason can be defeated by a recrudescence of obsolete bigotry.

“ For myself (page 34), indeed, I do not believe that the power of Protestant bigotry in this matter is at all commensurate with the noise which it makes, and I have no doubt that a courageous policy on the part of the Government will prove in the end the best policy. . . . Even Ulster will think twice before it jumps from the frying-pan into the fire to vex the Government. ‘ Because barely a dozen grasshoppers under a fern,’ says Burke,¹ ‘ make the field ring with their importunate chink, whilst thousands of cattle, reposing beneath the shadow of the British oak, chew the cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who

¹ Burke's *Works*, vol. iv., p. 220.

make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field; that of course they are many in number; or that, after all, they are other than the little, shrivelled, meagre, hopping, though loud and troublesome insects of the hour.'

"How slow mankind is to learn from experience! And Ireland is the paramount example of it in the history of the British Empire."

In this statement of the case by the Rev. Dr. MacColl, we have briefly reviewed this one among many of the great crimes of injustice against Ireland: and it has been done on the evidence presented from not only an English but a Protestant standpoint, as expressed by a charitable and fair-minded man.

Isaac Butt has truthfully stated¹:

"There is but one secret in governing Ireland, as there is in governing any country. Let it be governed for the good of the whole people. Let us abandon the policy of maintaining any English interest, or any Protestant interest, or any class interest, or any interest but that of the Irish people. When every measure of government, and every institution of the country are moulded and adapted to meet the wants, the wishes and the capabilities of that people—when, in a word, Irish legislation is influenced as exclusively, by reference to the wants and wishes of Ireland, as English legislation is by a reference to those of England, then, and then only, will Ireland be governed as a free country."

This desideratum can only be gained by an Irish Parliament whose members, as representatives of every class and interest, are familiar with the wants of the country.

¹ *The Irish People and the Irish Land*, etc., Dublin, 1867, p. 239.

CHAPTER VI

THE LAND QUESTION

WE cannot dismiss a consideration of Ireland's past, present or future without special reference to her land question. In the past this question has caused great injury to the people and is at present a potent factor in producing the impoverished condition of the country. A proper disposition of the land question dwarfs by comparison the importance of every other interest in the future prosperity of Ireland. All important as the gaining of Home Rule would be and unity of the Irish people, these are but stepping-stones, as it were, towards gaining the one object which must be paramount. Ireland's prosperity in the future would still remain uncertain, were both Home Rule and unity gained and the land question left in abeyance.

In the early history of the country the lands of Ireland were constantly changing ownership from one tribe to another, as an accepted result of open warfare. But the title to every foot of land in Ireland has to-day no better foundation in equity than the booty of a highwayman, gained by brute force.

The people of Ulster were forced by James I., of Connaught by Charles I. and the remainder of Ireland, outside of the pale, by Cromwell into a war of self-defence by which they were robbed of their property and lost their lives to so great a number that the Irish race was nearly exterminated. No words could possibly convey to the reader of the present day more than a slight appreciation of the horrors

perpetrated and the sufferings endured in these wars, planned and caused by the English Government for the purpose of exterminating the Irish people by the sword and by starvation and of seizing their lands eventually for the Crown.

One great source of disquietude and of lasting hatred toward the English Government, on the part of a large portion of the Irish people, has been the knowledge of these massacres and robberies, transmitted from one generation to another. We have already stated that a large proportion of the Irish, now found in the humbler walks of life in Ireland and abroad, sprang by direct descent from a portion of those who were thus despoiled. From those born in Ireland, who still preserve their family traditions, the writer has often obtained detailed accounts of their ancestors and he has frequently been informed of even the name of the family in possession of the confiscated property. He, moreover, recognized the congenital impression made upon the minds of these people who had lived for generations in a land filled with spies and informers, for they were generally very reticent when speaking of their past and were only unreserved with those in whom they had the greatest confidence.

After the lands seized in the seventeenth century had passed into the possession of the friends of the Government, it was not possible to obtain laborers to cultivate the soil owing to the great reduction in the population. Naturally large tracts of country which otherwise would have been cultivated fell into use for sheep and cattle ranges. The Penal Laws at that time barred the Catholics from owning land by purchase or by gift as well as from holding a lease for farming purposes beyond a limited period; the profits from which could not exceed a certain per cent. without an increase in rent. As the Catholics obtained the means, by shop-keeping and the like pursuits in trade which were left open to them, they gradually acquired leases of large tracts of country for grazing purposes and these they sublet to less prosperous members of their belief. This plan proved a profitable investment, as it was difficult if not

impossible for the informer to ascertain the amount of profit gained by the Catholic holders of the leases. For many years cattle-raising was very profitable and a greater quantity of beef was exported from Ireland than from all other countries in Europe. The Government at first encouraged the industry by making all lands used for grazing purposes free from the tithe tax, which had proved in Ireland a grievous burden for the agriculturist. The apparent object on the part of the Government in remitting this tax was to discourage the tendency, which appeared from time to time in the Irish, to engage in various manufacturing interests to the detriment of the English people; hence agriculture, being thus exempt from paying tithes, became the most profitable.

After the woollen and other industries conducted by Protestants at the north had been destroyed by William of Orange and like efforts by the Government from time to time had been equally successful elsewhere, after noted frosts and the famines following, as in 1728 and 1741, had occurred, a greater impetus was given to emigration. Consequently, for a time, tilling of the ground was neglected and a still greater proportion of land became stocked with cattle. This was notably the case after the great frost of 1740 and after the fearful famine of the following year, in which it has been calculated that fully one-third of the Catholic portion of the people of Ireland died in a few months. By others it has been claimed that the death-rate was even greater and that the reduction in population fully equalled the loss of life which Charles I. caused to take place in 1641. This period was also noted for the beginning of the second extensive emigration from Ulster, which consisted chiefly of Presbyterians with some Catholics, and from this time until the beginning of the American Revolution there was a steady outgoing of these people to the American Colonies. We have already referred to the emigration of the so-called Scotch-Irish in the beginning of the eighteenth century to France but for a hundred years before the famine of 1741

the emigration had been almost entirely Catholic, from the west coast of Ireland to the Continent and thence to the frontiers of the American Colonies.

From this period so large a proportion of the more fertile lands became appropriated for grazing purposes that the Government, through the Irish Parliament, was obliged to pass a law that one acre out of every five should be devoted to tillage; but at no time was this law fully enforced. The leases on many large estates ran out about this time and they purposely were not renewed. As many tenants were unable to pay their rent numerous evictions took place to recover the lands for grazing purposes, so that the people who did not leave the country were gradually driven to the bogs and the barren wastes of the hilly and mountainous portions. For over one hundred years this evil has been extending throughout Ireland until at length a condition has been reached where there does not exist arable land enough, within the command of the poorer class of people, to raise sufficient quantity of food to feed the present population, even reduced in numbers as it has been to one-half within the past fifty years. The lands now cultivated by the greater portion of the people are scarcely fitted to raise the potato, the almost exclusive article of food now to be obtained by the people from the soil. The greater portion of the soil under cultivation by the poorer classes at the present time is boggy to a great extent and cannot be properly drained without capital while the rent is often greater than the average paid in Ulster for fertile land. As nearly every third season is a wet one, which rots the potato, from this and other causes a famine in Ireland has become of frequent occurrence,¹ notwithstanding that the grain crop of the country is often at the same time an abundant

¹ Adam Smith, in his *Enquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, London, 1776, predicted: "Should potatoes ever become the favourite food of the poor, the population would increase and rents would rise much beyond what they are at present." In Ireland his predictions were verified but the increased population has been reduced by famine and emigration.

one; but this is all exported. According to the latest official data in 1897, the area of Ireland was said to be 20,820,000 acres. Of this three-fourths, or 15,000,000 acres, are arable. Of the arable land it was held that 11,384,279 acres were used as permanent pasture, that 1,251,400 acres were planted with clover and grass for producing hay and only 2,523,254 acres were used for raising crops. Thus twelve per cent. of all the arable lands of Ireland was under cultivation. If, with more accurate knowledge, we could deduct from the remaining 5,660,977 acres, which are not rated as fit for cultivation, the surface covered with water, the inaccessible portions among the mountains and the rocky surface elsewhere, it would be made evident that the remaining land from which the great mass of the Irish population can obtain their only means of support must prove inadequate even under the most favorable circumstances.

Therefore, the one great need of the mass of the Irish population, to rescue them from a condition of chronic starvation, is to place the pasture lands within reach of the people that they may be able to gain by cultivation a sufficient supply of food.

After placing the reader in possession of some information relating to the ownership of land in Ireland, this important subject will be again considered.

Before the large Catholic land-holders had been displaced by Cromwell, wherever a large proportion of the tenantry were of the Protestant faith, the Irish Parliament with the approval of the English Government enacted a law by which every improvement made by the tenant, with or without the consent of the landlord, should stand as a lien upon the property until the claim was settled. But in time the foreign element became the holders of the land and the tenants in turn were then the impoverished Irish people. Consequently, this law was no longer observed and became forgotten throughout Ireland except in the province of Ulster, where the land-holders and tenants were both Protestant at the time the law was enacted.

For over two hundred years the landlords of Ireland have, as a rule, done nothing to improve their property while in the greater proportion of instances the value has been created and maintained only by the tenant. Under a late decision of the highest legal authority in England it was determined that this law, in relation to the improvements made by the tenants, had been applicable to the whole of Ireland instead of to Ulster alone; where it had continued to be in operation and where the leases were known as the "Ulster Grants."

During Mr. Gladstone's administration a commission was appointed in accord with this decision to adjudicate in Ireland the claims of each tenant. Yet, through the influence of the Tory landlord class, practically nothing has been done and nothing will be done by the present English Government to enforce the law. In a few instances, where tenants have applied to this court for justice and their claims were sustained, they were afterwards evicted by the aid of the Tory Government and no effort was made to reinstate them. And, through an evident agreement among the land-holders, as if to intimidate others, not one of these evicted tenants in Ireland, so far as the writer has been informed, has since been able to lease a foot of land through the aid of this law. Every effort has been made by the leaders of the National party; but Parliament has refused to pass any additional act by which the above-stated ruling would be enforced and the evicted tenants relieved.

Very few persons realize that if this law were enforced and the tenants were thereby compensated for the loss sustained by them, all title of the landlord to the property would be in most instances wiped out; and often the reputed owner would stand as debtor to the tenant. Whatever may be the title of the Irish landlord, gained, as a rule, only by length of possession, the reader should realize that the evicted tenant of the past in Ireland has had generally a better legal right to the property than the reputed owner, if he could have obtained justice. Consequently he is not

always the criminal, he is represented to be by the English Press.

Mr. Fox states ¹:

“Quite recently, Mr. Labouchère, M.P., in a speech at a public meeting in Northampton, thus accurately defined the peculiar nature of the Irish tenure of land and the complications arising therefrom at the present moment in the sister country. Lord Salisbury’s reverence for property, as it is understood in England, will not permit him to proceed to a logical conclusion with regard to the ‘dual ownership’ in Ireland though this has a veritable existence there:

“It is desirable in view of the attempt which is now being made to prejudice public opinion against the Irish by terming their struggle for their existence anarchy, that the facts should not be obscured. In Ireland there is a dual ownership of land. It belongs to the landlord and the tenant. This was laid down by the Devon Commission as far back as 1845. Mr. Gladstone’s Land Act gave effect to this principle, and it went further, for it established that the tenant was the preferred owner and the landlord the deferred owner. The first charge on the land was declared to be the amount from its produce which sufficed to enable the tenant to live and thrive; the rent was any margin that might remain after this. The Land Courts laid down what, in each particular case, that margin was likely to be. The Conservatives denounced this as an attack upon property. But the Legislature held that a nation cannot starve in order that a few men should be allowed to suck its life blood. Since then the price of produce has fallen, and it has become impossible for the tenants to earn enough from the land to live, much less enough to thrive, and at the same time to pay the judicial rent.” (See London *Times* Report.)

Mr. Fox states in a subsequent chapter:

“One of the commonest contentions amongst persons attempting a defence of Irish landlordism is that ‘a man should be allowed to do what he likes with his own’; a maxim which presupposes an absolute ownership in land, though this is a thing

¹ Pp. 14, 16.

which in realty has no existence. According to a recognized legal text-book, 'the first thing the student has to do is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership (of land). Such an idea is quite unknown to the English law. No man is in law the absolute owner of lands. He can only hold an estate in them. . . . All land-owners are merely tenants in the eye of the law' (Williams on *Real Property*, pp. 16-55).

"Mr. Herbert Spencer, who should be esteemed an authority on the subject also, in his *Social Statics*, etc. (chap. ix., sec. 2), says: 'Equity does not permit property in land. For if one portion of the earth's surface may justly become the possession of an individual, held for his sole use and benefit, as a thing to which he has an exclusive right, then other portions of the surface may be held, and our planet may thus lapse into private hands. It follows that if the land-owners have a valid right to its surface, all who are not land-owners have no right at all to its surface. Hence, such can exist on the earth by sufferance only. They are all trespassers. Save by permission of the landlords they can have no room for the soles of their feet—nay, these landless men may be equitably expelled from the earth altogether.'

"And John Stuart Mill, from whom the English-speaking world is still content to take no inconsiderable share of its thinking, observes as follows:

"'What has been epigrammatically said in the discussion on "peculiar burdens" is literally true when applied to them; that the greatest burden on land is the landlords. Returning nothing to the soil, they consume its whole produce, minus the potatoes strictly necessary to keep the inhabitants from dying of famine; and when they have any purpose of improvement, the preparatory step usually consists in not leaving even this pittance, but turning out the people to beggary, if not to starvation. When landed property has placed itself on this footing it ceases to be defensible, and the time has come for making some new arrangement of the matter. When the "sacredness of property" is talked of, it should always be remembered that any such sacredness does not belong in the same degree to landed property. *No man made the land*. It is the original inheritance of the whole species. Its appropriation is a question of general expediency. When private property in land is not expedient it is unjust.'"

Mr. Fox continues (page 17):

“The agrarian agitation of the Victorian era would appear to have had its prototype three centuries ago; for in the State Papers for 1577, there is a report from the Irish Chancellor to Walsingham denouncing the ‘cruelty of the landlords’ reducing the ‘tenants to be starved beggars’; and a despatch from the Lord Deputy to Elizabeth recommending ‘Commissioners to settle the rent’ landlords should take of their tenants, and also ‘a commission to compound for arrears.’”

This only shows that the evil followed immediately upon robbing the Irish people of their lands; that it has existed year after year and will continue, with all the entailed sufferings, as a grievous crime until restitution be made by placing it within the power of every man to control land enough to yield an adequate support for himself and his family.

Isaac Butt taught¹:

“Whilst the arbitrary power of eviction lasts, the sword of Oliver Cromwell is suspended over every peasant’s door. Until you give that peasant security of tenure, so far as he is concerned the penal laws are unrepealed. Over and over again it was pointed out that the title of the House of Hanover to the Throne and the title of the Irish land-owners to their estates, both rested on the exclusion of the old possessors and loyalty and self-interest and the rights of property were all alike invoked as a justification on the policy which deprived the Irish people of all freedom and independence upon the soil of their native land. To protect the title, the influence, and the position of the landed proprietors, was the policy and the object of the penal laws. The same policy prompted the worse administrative oppression by which the people were crushed down. The laws prescribing religion have been repealed. But the very policy of the penal code is carried out by a mode more suited to that which we are pleased to call the liberality of this generation. . . . The land-owners have discovered the force of the tremendous weapon which, in the ownership, the law had placed in their hands. . . . It

¹ Pp. 246-247.

seems strange that a landlord who may clear a whole country-side of its inhabitants to the imminent peril of the peace, it may be half a province, has the absolute right of commanding, if necessary, all the military in the country to aid him in the execution of his cruelty. Yet such is the law. The Sheriff is bound to obey the Queen's writ and if force be necessary to execute it. He is entitled and indeed bound to call to his aid, as part of the *posse comitatus*, all the military force that may be in the country. Soldiers are not more exempt than civilians from the obligations which the law imposes on every one to aid the Sheriff. The practical result is that a landlord has actually a right to order out the military to drive out his tenants. . . . This employment of the executive to aid in the extermination of the people has occurred frequently enough to identify, in the minds of the people, English power with their oppression."

In consequence of the abuse the process had to be modified in time to satisfy public opinion but the execution was only simplified, as we will see hereafter, without lessening the power of the landlord.

Mrs. Foster, in her book¹ gives a chapter on "Eviction" in which she describes how the Irish tenant is turned out from his home, which has generally been held by his family for generations; the eviction taking place in consequence of inability to pay an impossible rent. With the aid of the law and the Government officials eviction was easily accomplished and the vacated home was generally burned or the roof was removed, so that it could not again be occupied.

But the injustice of the procedure, as has been already stated, lay in the fact that generally the labor of the tenant had given all the existing value to the property and the so-called landlord owner may have never contributed a penny to that end!

Mrs. Foster makes the statement that:

"During the last five years (previous to 1888) the Inspector-General of Constabulary estimates over fifty-seven thousand persons to have thus been dispossessed. *Within the fifty years of*

¹ *The Crime against Ireland*, 1888, p. 40.

Queen Victoria's reign, not less than four millions have been by these 'forms of law' turned from their homes !"

The Dublin *Freeman's Journal*, September 24, 1900, refers to eviction, from the date when Mrs. Foster quoted from the report of the Inspector-General. The subject of the *Freeman's* editorial was a speech made recently by the Attorney-General of Ireland, to vindicate the Government from the unjust charge of appointing an undue proportion of Catholics to office and the statement made by him has already been given to the reader in a tabulated form. The editor writes:

"In one part of his speech the Attorney-General was particularly disingenuous. He quoted the statistics of evictions and crime to prove the improvement of the country beginning with 1886. The statistics run—'evictions: 1886, 3781; 1892, 907; 1896, 671; 1899, 454.' And a note is appended which says: 'The number of evictions in 1899 was lower than in any previous year since 1849 (when these statistics were first compiled), with the exception of the years 1869 and 1872, when the numbers were 374 and 325 respectively.' The selection of 1886 as the first year proves the deliberate character of the misrepresentation here attempted; for it was in 1887 that the eviction-made-easy section was passed with the aid of the farmer's friend, Mr. T. W. Russell. Since then it is no longer necessary to 'evict' tenants in order to deprive them of all rights and rob them of improvements. They are now turned into caretakers by a registered letter. *Fifty thousand tenants have had their rights thus destroyed since 1887. Last year (1899), nearly four thousand were so served.* So that it is easy to understand why 'evictions' are lower than in any year since 1849 with the exception of two. Evictions are no longer necessary for purposes of landlord plunder."

The landlord is at liberty to discharge at will any one in his employ; hence the newly appointed caretaker renders but a short service. Eviction is thus made easy. Isaac Butt, M. P., the originator of the Home Rule movement as carried on by Parnell, pointed out the great difference existing

between the Irish and English tenant in the method of ejectment as follows¹:

“In Ireland tenants holding from year to year, constituting now the immense majority of Irish tenants, are subject to ejectment for non-payment of rent—a process which in England cannot be used against such tenants. That process is enforced under a Penal Code against the tenantry, which is unknown in English law, and it is enforced in a local tribunal and in a summary and expeditious manner; while in England the landlord seeking to get rid of such a tenant, must first serve him with a notice to quit, and then proceed to evict him by a costly and dilatory process of an action in the superior courts. The result is, that in England a recourse to ejectment is a rare and exceptional resort. In Ireland it is an ordinary occurrence, actually a part of the routine management of some estates.

“In the northern portion of Ulster there was an unwritten law termed the ‘Tenant’s Right of Ulster.’ Though the tenure might be nominally ‘at will,’ he could not be ejected so long as he paid his rent and, if he wished to remove to some other part of the country, he could sell his ‘good will’ on the improvements he had made to the incoming tenant; but in every other portion of Ireland the removal of the tenant lay with the landlord, at will.”

We will continue to quote from Mr. Fox’s work and give a few instances and authorities cited by him on evictions. He writes:

“Nor are Protestant clergymen in England silent either. The Rev. John Urquhart of Weston-super-Mare, boldly denounces Irish evictions as ‘legalized murder.’ He observes: ‘Evictions still go on. One hundred and ten families, numbering 700 persons, have just been evicted at and around Carraroe, Galway (on the property of an absentee landlord). These people are actually dying of starvation, and yet the forces of the Crown are sent to burn down their miserable houses because they cannot pay impossible rents. Similar scenes occur weekly. It seems utterly

¹ *The Irish People and the Irish Land*, p. 190.

incredible that this system of *legalized murder* could be persisted in by beings claiming to be human. But month after month, year after year it went on. It went on, too, under the very eyes of a well-informed British Government and no restraint was laid upon it. Would this have been possible under any system of Home Rule? ¹

“In the House of Commons Lord John Russell terrified his hearers by going into details of an eviction in which ‘a whole village containing 270 persons was razed to the ground and the entire of that large number of individuals sent adrift on the high road to sleep under the hedges without obtaining shelter even among the walls of the houses.’ And Sir Robert Peel said, referring to the official report, which had reached him: ‘I do not think that the records of any country, civilized or barbarous, present materials for such a picture. Three such tragical instances I do not believe were ever presented, either in point of fact or conjured up in the imagination of any human being’; referring to the case of two children lying asleep on the corpse of their dead father, while their mother was dying fast of dysentery, etc.” ²

“Mr. (now Sir George) Trevelyan, Chief Secretary for Ireland, speaking in the House of Commons in 1882, said:

“‘Every day the Government gets reports of evictions . . . and at this moment in one part of the country men are being turned out of their houses, actually by battalions, who are no more able to pay the arrears of these bad years than they are able to pay the National debt. I have seen a private account from a very trustworthy source—from a source any one would allow to be trustworthy—of what is going on in Connemara.’ In these days 150 families were turned out, numbering 750 persons, etc.” ³

“It may be well to recall what an eviction, as conducted in Ireland, commonly is.” Professor Cairnes proceeds:

“‘Most frequently, the evicted tenant has for himself and those dependent upon him absolutely no means of support, or place of shelter outside his farm. The evictions, moreover, having almost invariably taken place for the purpose of consolidating farms; even where non-payment has been the legal ground, the

¹ Fox, p. 64.

² *Ibid.*, p. 53.
VOL. II.—7.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

pulling down of the tenant's house has been an almost constant incident in the scene—an incident too generally performed at night, if not over the very heads of the retiring family, who are thrust forth, it may be in mid-winter, frequently half-naked and starving. In the rare instances in which they have saved enough to procure them a passage to New York, they will probably emigrate at once; where this is not the case, they will cower, often for days and weeks together, in ditches by the roadsides, depending for their support upon casual charity.'—(*Political Essays*, pp. 193-195.)

"Strange devices were used to accomplish the purpose of the evictor. For instance, a Tipperary landlord, of a mechanical turn, invented a machine of ropes and pulleys for the speedier unroofing and demolition of homesteads, which enabled the 'Crow-bar brigade,' as the *Times* called them, to effect their full purpose with greater surety as well as despatch. It consisted of massive iron levers, hooks and chains, to which horses were yoked. By deftly fixing the hooks and levers at the proper points of the rafters, at one crack of the whip and pull of the horses the roof was brought away. By some similarly skilful gripping of coign-stones, the house walls were torn to pieces. It was found that two of these machines enabled a sheriff to evict ten times as many peasant families in a day as could be got through by a Crow-bar brigade of fifty men.'—(*New Ireland*, p. 122.)

"In the course of a Pastoral issued by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath, Dr. McNulty, in February, 1871, he gives an awful picture of an eviction scene witnessed by himself some years before. Space forbids more than the barest extract from it. The Bishop observes²:

"At length an incident occurred that varied the monotony of the grim, ghastly ruin which they (the sheriff and his myrmidons) were spreading all around. They stopped suddenly, and recoiled panic-stricken with terror from two dwellings which they were directed to destroy with the rest. They had just learned that a frightful typhus-fever held those houses in its grasp and had already brought pestilence and death to their inmates. They therefore supplicated the agent to spare these houses a little longer;

¹ Fox, p. 51.

² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

but the agent was inexorable and insisted that the houses should come down. The ingenuity with which he extricated himself from the difficulties of the situation was characteristic alike of the heartlessness of the man and of the cruel necessities of the work in which he was engaged. He ordered a large winnowing sheet to be secured over the beds in which the fever victims lay—fortunately they happened to be perfectly delirious at the time—and then directed the house to be unroofed cautiously and slowly “because,” he said, “he very much disliked the bother and discomfort of a coroner’s inquest.”’

“It was under these circumstances that the Bishop—then a curate—administered the last consolations of religion to the dying, with nothing but the winnowing sheets between him and the canopy of heaven, he solemnly declared.

“What became of the homeless people?”¹

“Mr. Bright, speaking in the House of Commons, on the 25th of August, 1848, observed:

“‘Let us think of the half-million who within two years past have perished miserably in the workhouses, on the highways and in their hovels—more—far more—than ever fell by the sword in any war this country ever waged; let us think of the crop of nameless horrors which is even now growing up in Ireland, whose disastrous fruit may be gathered in years and generations to come.’

“There is an impressive passage in the writings of an author of acknowledged authority whom I have already quoted, as regards one result of the campaign which is of serious import for England. Professor Cairnes thus closes his observations on the subject, in his *Fragments on Ireland*²:

“‘Not a few public writers feel much difficulty in accounting for the persistent hatred manifested by a portion of the Irish people for the English name. . . . It might help these writers to a solution of their difficulty, if they would reflect on the condition of mind in which the victims of the violent expulsions just described must have crossed the Atlantic. Is it strange if, in after years, the picture of the sheriff and his posse, with crow-bars and torch, and the smoking ruins of their hovels tumbling to pieces over their heads,—if the nights spent in the ditch by the

¹ Fox, p. 51.

² *Ibid.*, p. 56.

wayside and all the wretchedness of the tramp to the port,—if these things should find a more permanent place in their imagination than the advantages of Catholic Emancipation, Corporate Reform, the National School, or the Encumbered Estates Court? Men leaving their country full of such bitter recollections would naturally not be forward to disseminate the most amiable ideas respecting Irish landlordism *and the power which upholds it*. I own I cannot wonder that a thirst for revenge should spring from such calamities; that hatred, even undying hatred, for what they could not but regard as the cause and symbol of their misfortunes—English rule in Ireland—should possess the sufferers; that it should grow into a passion, into a religion, to be preached with fanatic zeal to their kindred, and bequeathed to posterity. . . . The disaffection now so widely diffused throughout Ireland may possibly in some degree be fed from historical traditions, and have its remote origin in the confiscations of the seventeenth century; but all that gives it energy, all that renders it dangerous, may, I believe, be traced to exasperation produced by recent transactions, and more especially to the bitter memories left by that most flagrant abuse of the rights of property, and most scandalous disregard of the claims of humanity—the wholesale clearances of the period following the famine.”—(*Political Essays*, pp. 197–198.)

Professor Cairnes' statement of the situation is perfectly correct. The Irish people have had the same misgovernment and the same causes of grievances for hundreds of years past and one above all, which cannot be forgotten, is the fact that the English Government has been indifferent throughout and has never acted for Ireland's benefit unless forced to do so.

“Sydney Smith denied thus emphatically that any voluntary concession was ever made by England to Ireland”:

“*What did Ireland ever ask that was granted? What did she ever demand that was not refused? How did she get her Mutiny Bill—a limited Parliament—a repeal of the Poyning's law—a constitution? Not by the concessions of England, but by her fears.*

¹ Fox, p. 106.

England's Historical Attitude to Ireland 101

When Ireland asked for all these things upon her knees, her petitions were rejected with Percivalism and contempt; and when she demanded them with the voice of sixty thousand armed men, they were granted with every mark of consternation and dismay.”
—(*Works*, Longman's edition, p. 599.)

CHAPTER VII

THE POVERTY OF THE IRISH PEOPLE

FOR years past the average yearly value on all agricultural products of Ireland has been about forty millions of dollars, nearly all of which, with the exception of a portion of the potato crop, is sent out of the country as soon as it can be harvested and shipped to pay the indebtedness of the people. Then the country is often taxed on the importation afterwards of such products as are needed to meet the wants of those in better circumstances.

The manufactories of Ulster are not particularly profitable and the other industries of Ireland elsewhere are of little value. The profits from the limited commerce of Ireland do not accrue to her own people and all profits from other sources generally pass out of the country. All the available means of the Irish people and such as can be gained for their support through personal efforts must come from the soil and from the fixed incomes and salaries of the officials and of those employed for special service. *Per contra*, Ireland's yearly tax for rent is not less than nine millions of pounds or forty-five millions of dollars. If we consider the tax paid by the Irish people and estimate the value and quantity of everything it is possible to produce under the most favorable circumstances, with the fear of starvation ever before them for some portion of each year, it is then made evident that no other people are so grievously taxed for simply the inadequate means of existence.

Notwithstanding that rents have been reduced, from necessity, throughout Ireland in the present impoverished condition of the country, it will soon be difficult for the people in a large section of country to pay any rent at all and escape starvation. For years past the landlords of Ireland have actually received in some sections more rent-money than the value of the amount of produce raised from the land. For years past the rent in no portion could have been paid without the millions of dollars which were sent to the relatives in Ireland by the sons and daughters who had emigrated to the United States and elsewhere during the past fifty years.

Of late, the immense sums which we have shown were thus received proved insufficient to meet the demands of the landlords. Within what is termed the congested districts where, by the definition of the Land Act of 1891 the average individual holding or rental should be below £1 10s. in value, there exists from year to year a threatened famine. Here under the most favorable circumstances it is not possible to obtain from the soil a sufficient yield to maintain the population in any other condition than one of semi-starvation.

These districts, situated chiefly in Connaught, Clair, Kerry and the upper portions of Donegal, contain about three and a half millions of barren or bog lands, onto which the most destitute of the Irish people who did not emigrate have been gradually crowded, as they were evicted and driven from the more fertile lands. A large number had been evicted, unable to pay the rent, while many were displaced without remuneration, where the labor of their ancestors for generations had established the value of the holding. This rent had been paid and would have been paid again in time but all were displaced and their houses destroyed to establish cattle ranges. From these districts a large number of men have been forced every summer to make their way, on foot as far as possible, to England or Scotland that they might gain a few extra pounds by assisting in gathering the

harvest. The suffering endured to obtain this pittance can be easily imagined. But when we realize that, with the increasing want, a large number of the young girls also from these districts have for several years past been compelled to subject themselves to the exposure and privation of the same journey, to gain a few shillings in the potato fields of Great Britain, it would be an appalling fact even if their suffering were limited only to those attending unavoidable circumstances. The facts are that all are subjected to a terrible experience.

If the same number of English or Scotch girls were forced under the same circumstances every year to endure an equal amount of privation in a journey to the harvest fields of Ireland; if through the miserly thrift or indifference of the Irish farmers they were half starved and herded together not even as cattle, fortunate if a scant portion of damp or half-rotten straw separated them from the bare ground; if many of them died every year from pneumonia and other diseases, while a large number reached home only to die of consumption—is it credible that the English authorities would not promptly take action for their protection? Can it be believed that they are ignorant of the facts we have stated? It is not to be expected that the sufferings of these poor women in England or Scotland should excite the sympathy of the Government any more than have their suffering in Ireland. History teaches that their nationality is a sufficient bar.¹

In England and in every other country but in Ireland, the landlord drains the land, does all the necessary repairs, builds the dwelling and the necessary outbuildings. In Ireland the tenant must make all improvements and must afterwards submit to an increase of rent in proportion to the greater value the land has gained through his efforts; so that the average price per acre for agricultural purposes has been greater in Ireland than in any other country.

The interest of the Irish land-owner alone has in the past been legally considered, for the British Parliament by

¹ See Appendix, note 20.

special legislation and by various coercion acts has given him a facility for collecting his rent which no English landlord would dare expect. The Protestant landlords exercise a special power which would be tolerated in no other country. The Irish landlord can evict at pleasure without the aid of a magistrate or any legal process, he can command the services of any officer of the Crown, can call upon any number of the constabulary force and has equally the right to demand the aid of his Majesty's troops at any point. By a recent law making the tenant a "caretaker" the landlord is now relieved of all trouble, as he can discharge his employee immediately when he has no longer need of his services.

A more cruel, merciless and oppressive power could emanate from no other so-called civilized country. No other country but England, when legislating especially for Ireland, ever placed within the control of individuals of a favored class a like irresponsible power and one deliberately formulated to cause the greatest possible degree of injustice and suffering.

Could the landlord dispense with an agent and deal directly with the cultivator of the soil the evil would be corrected to some extent and both parties greatly benefited. Frequently from indolence on the part of the landlord or in consequence of prolonged absence from the country, the owner and the tenants in Ireland have had no interest in common except the rent and have been strangers for centuries. The agent or middle-man has thus existed as a necessity, to the detriment of both. The custom of subletting land in Ireland is a very old one and it exists to a greater extent there than in any other country. The land-holder is often willing to lease a large tract for a long term of years at a moderate rent, from which if promptly paid the compensation is sufficient and he is thus freed from annoyance. Numerous instances have been cited where such property, held on a long lease, has been divided up into smaller holdings and sublet, the title passing afterwards through four or five different holders. Each person who subdivides and relets expects to do so at a profit and in many instances as a business the

profits thus obtained have afforded ample means of support. The absentee has always suffered, as his agent must make his position profitable and each tenant in the subletting to the other expects to do the same. Ultimately the one in actual possession is seldom able, at the present time, to derive from the soil, as the result of his labor, a sufficiency to meet his indebtedness. This subject was the object of official investigation about the close of the last century, when it was shown that the land-owners frequently did not receive more than one-third or a quarter of the sum finally exacted from the real tenant. It is believed that the same system exists at the present time in Ireland but to a somewhat less degree. The remedy certainly rests with the landlord and he must, naturally, be held responsible for the oppression and injustice from which the tenants so frequently suffer.

On the 16th December, 1778, Lord Nugent in the House of Commons described the Irish people as suffering all the destitution and distress which it was possible for human nature to endure.

He stated that nine-tenths of the people then earned no more than fourpence (eight cents) a day. In summer their whole food consisted of potatoes and butter-milk; in winter of potatoes and water. Lord Nugent should have stated that this was the diet of the Irish peasant under the most favorable circumstances and that steady and general employment, even at fourpence a day, could not be obtained.

During the great famine in Ireland from 1846-1850, large quantities of meal from ground Indian corn were sent from this country for the relief of the Irish people. Cultivation of the Indian corn or maize shortly after became an important industry for the poorer classes of the west coast of Ireland, with every prospect of becoming as valuable an article of food as the potato. But in common with every industry blighted by the English Government, this important staple was lost to Ireland.

England's long-established system of high protective duty for her own products in time ruined all of Ireland's indus-

tries, where free trade was necessary for their development and protection. After Ireland had been forced to give up her manufactories and become essentially an agricultural country, it was then to the interest of England to repeal her Corn Laws and become a free trader. This action again proved detrimental to Ireland's prosperity. Cultivation of the maize ceased from the fact that the rents then demanded in Ireland were so exorbitant in proportion to the value of that portion of the land within reach of the people that meal could be imported from this country at less cost. Had the people possessed the means to purchase, this result would have been advantageous. But with an internal tax on its consumption, as if levied to punish those who were most indigent and unable to pay the additional cost, this important article of food so well fitted for the needs of the greater portion of the people was not attainable.

The paltry tax added little to the revenue of the Government but greatly increased the suffering of the people without lessening Irish taxation. England's free trade policy consequently developed greatly the grazing interests, controlled by those in the English interest, while the great mass of the people were left without adequate means of support.

The history of every industry by which the Irish people proper could be benefited but repeats itself in the mode of their destruction.

The writer in 1885 was told by a man living on the west coast of Ireland that he had not earned over two shillings in cash for work during the previous year and that he and a large family had subsisted entirely on the potatoes he had raised; while very few in his neighborhood had done so well.

In the *Annual Register* (1847, p. 9) it is stated:

"The Poor Law Inquiry of 1835 reported that throughout Ireland 2,235,000 persons were out of work and in distress for thirty weeks in the year."

The British Government in a recent publication giving the returns relating to agricultural labor states that in 1899

the average earnings per week in Scotland was eighteen shillings; England, sixteen shillings and ten pence; Wales, sixteen shillings and five pence; and in Ireland ten shillings and one penny, while in County Mayo, the lowest on the list where regular employment could be obtained, the laborer averaged but eight shillings and seven pence per week. Hence, the Irish laborer, both men and women, as already shown, have for years past been compelled to leave home in large numbers during the harvest season in England; after suffering great hardships, the pittance thus received soon leaves the country for the support of the absentee landlord. Without the harvest money and aid from relatives in America no rent could be paid in Ireland, so exorbitant is the charge in proportion to the possible productive value.

The great problem to be solved in Ireland is to determine the means by which every man in need may be able to obtain productive land, so that by his own industry an adequate supply of food may be produced to meet the wants of his family. It is most important, also, that all leases be given for a longer term than is now the custom and the tenant should hold as a right a lien on the land for all improvements and increase in value due to his own efforts; this he could dispose of to his own advantage. As soon as the necessity arises facilities should be developed sufficient to enable him to reach a market and obtain a profit on his labor for produce, over and above the quantity needed for the necessities of his family. But, for the relief of the people as a whole, it will be necessary to devise means by which the title for every acre of grazing land in Ireland shall pass from the present owner to the Government and from the Government to the people in fee simple, after liberal facility has been afforded to acquire ownership. An honest effort on the part of the British Government to establish this plan for relief would prove the peacemaker in Ireland.

The title to all land throughout the world rests in the beginning on force and while, as we have shown, there exists

in Ireland no better right to the titles held there, the unbroken possession, from the time the Irish people were robbed of their lands to the present day, gives the present holder a title which must be respected.

While it would be an injustice under ordinary circumstances to seize the estate of a single individual, every Government has the inherent right to condemn property to any extent for the public good, provided a reasonable compensation be given in return. There can exist but little doubt of the necessity for such a course in Ireland, in the mind of any one who has given the matter more than superficial investigation. It seems equally certain that the Irish landholder would gladly accept any reasonable compensation for his interest, which is each year affording a less return than the previous one; the most favorable estimate made on the landed property of Ireland showing that, as has been stated, there has been a loss in value during the past ten years of fully fifty per cent.

To determine the plan by which the Government would in a reasonable time be compensated for the first outlay and by which the holder would ultimately receive a clear title to the lands constitutes the only difficulty; yet the arrangement of the details is a matter of little moment in comparison with the necessity demanding the step.

As Irishmen prosper at home and abroad under all favorable circumstances and frequently succeed in doing so under the most adverse conditions, there remains no reasonable doubt that, if their efforts in Ireland were honestly seconded by a Government anxious to establish such an undertaking, the result would be not only successful but profitable to both parties. There is, moreover, a very practical view to this question, namely, that the British Government could make no better investment to secure future content and peace throughout the country than to increase as much as possible the number of small land-holders who, being secure in possession, would become the most conservative element in every neighborhood. The discontent of many a man would

be removed on realizing that he had at last come, as he would reason, into possession of his own—"with a bit of the old land coming to him"; since every one would manage, where it was possible, to settle down on some portion from which his ancestors had been displaced between two and three centuries ago.

But such a change cannot be brought about directly by England, for the Irish people could not divest themselves of the recollection based upon their past experiences in connection with the pledged faith of the English Government; consequently they would give little credit to an English official for honesty of purpose in attempting to settle any question between the Irish landlord and themselves.

It must not be forgotten that the highest legal authority of Great Britain has recognized the fact that the Irish tenant holds a primitive claim in proportion to the improvements made by himself and his ancestors; in other words he becomes to that extent a joint owner with the landlord until the claim be liquidated.

Parliament, as has been stated, was in consequence of this decision forced to appoint a commission for the purpose of adjusting these claims yet, through the influence of the landlord, every tenant who attempted to obtain justice was evicted by the aid of the Government officials. The ruling and the law have both been ignored to a great extent. The British Government has not made the slightest honest effort to carry out the law nor have many tenants, who attempted legally thus to gain their rights, been able to obtain holdings from other landlords on application, because the price was intentionally placed beyond their means.

There is nothing to be done by the Irish people but patiently to abide their time and, with the use of all legal measures, to advance their object without resort to violence. The English Government, as we have seen, is an expert in provoking the Irish people to an outbreak and nothing would afford it greater satisfaction than to have pretext and opportunity for another attempt to exterminate them.

The occasion will surely come when England will favor Home Rule for Ireland; she may even have to take the initiative step for her own preservation. We have shown that the Royal Commission, appointed by the Imperial Parliament, reported that Ireland had been yearly overtaxed and that at the time this report was made the sum in the aggregate had already reached the equivalent of six hundred thousand millions of dollars. Since then, as we have also shown, Ireland's proportion has even been greatly increased.

England will never acknowledge the robbery, for robbery it has been. She has kept all the accounts between the two countries since the Union and it is not even presumable that she would have remained ignorant or silent if Ireland had at any time paid *less* than her proportion.

She has, however, ignored the report of her own commission and every effort made by the Irish members to bring the report before Parliament for open discussion has been uniformly defeated by the Government. England has more wealth at her command than any other nation but she has been noted always as a crafty and unscrupulous manager of her own affairs. She will therefore resist to the utmost, by every pretext and delay, the paying back to Ireland of a single penny she has gained by this overtaxation. She will only act, with any attempt of justice, in response to the irresistible pressure of public opinion and on the demand of a united people; unless such a necessity be created, even a compromise cannot be effected. The same movement, if successful, may force the granting of complete Home Rule and, as Ireland is bankrupt, the compromise should be that England pledges her credit or endorsement to the extent of the overpaid taxes for the purpose of obtaining the means to compensate the present land-holders for the distribution of the land among the people. The details of this compensation and the method of allotment could be perfected afterwards by the Irish officials of the new Government, since the necessary sum in all probability would have to be raised eventually in Ireland by taxation.

CHAPTER VIII

THE LAND LEAGUE MOVEMENT AND THE CONDITION OF THE IRISH TENANT

IT is necessary to trace somewhat in detail the rise and fall of the Land League movement in Ireland. Its chief purpose was to place the Irish people in possession, by purchase, of the land, in order to prevent the frequent recurrence of famine. Much was accomplished through the influence of the Land League in educating the people at home and abroad and the chief object might have been gained for the common good had the Irish people not become divided in their efforts. The Fenian movement was the resort of those who would accept no compromise in their determination to bring about a complete separation of Ireland from England. This influence was for a time exerted in the Land League organization but was finally checked by those who were more desirous of improving first the condition of the country. In consequence of this dissension the organization was finally destroyed by disintegration and Home Rule for Ireland remained to be gained, if possible, by constitutional measures. Finally, the movement was temporarily suspended for the development of the United Irish League, which was utilized to unite again the Irish people.

The Fenian movement we now know served a good purpose and the use of dynamite, which from the ordinary standards of civilization is an unjustifiable expedient under all circumstances, nevertheless proved of infinite use to the Irish cause. So indifferent had the public men of England

become to Ireland's cry and so deaf to every claim of justice, that no ordinary appeal would have had any effect. The use of dynamite was the first and the only means which ever roused sufficiently the interest of England in the affairs of Ireland. Mr. Gladstone had already employed coercion—England's only remedy for an outbreak—and few ever punished more grievously than he did. Yet Mr. Gladstone always held that the fact of resorting to so desperate a means for retaliation first prompted his investigation of the existing provocation, of which he had no previous knowledge.

The late Lord Derby said in Parliament :

“The Fenian movement agitated Ireland from 1864 to 1867, producing among other results the Clerkenwell explosion. Mr. Gladstone's statement as to the effect of this and similar attempts on the public mind of England, though too significant to be ignored, is too familiar to be repeated. I have too often heard this speech censured as unwise. For me it has always seemed that the exact and naked truth should be spoken without now regretting the disestablishment of the Irish Church or the passing of the Land Act of 1870, but it is to be regretted that for three times in the century an agitation accompanied by violence should be shown to be the most effective instrument of redressing Irish wrongs.”

If we attempt to pass judgment on the acts of those who resorted to the use of dynamite, in justice we must make an effort to understand their incentive. No one can doubt their sincerity of purpose, shown by the readiness with which they sacrificed their lives for the success of a cause more dear to them. These men were not the bloodthirsty monsters which those in sympathy with England would have us believe, for evidence is not wanting that in private life they were in no degree deficient in the attributes of humanity. They were desperate men, rendered desperate by the sufferings of their people who for centuries maintained a seemingly hopeless struggle to obtain justice from a merciless oppressor and by other means than these.

In time of war acts are justifiable which would be deemed murderous if committed during the existence of peace. But war has existed between the greater portion of the Irish people and the English Government for over six hundred years and no one in truth can hold that peace has had any existence in Ireland during this period. The war has been waged in the same relentless manner on both sides, the struggle merely being more active at times. In turn some part of the country has been under martial law for centuries and, at the beginning of the century, over more than half of Ireland all civil law had been arbitrarily suspended. Moreover, at no time during the English occupancy has civil law universally prevailed throughout the country. Would this be the case in any civilized country during a period of peace?

The justification of these men rests on the facts stated and he who would deny the existence of grievous provocation, from their standpoint, is hopelessly blinded by prejudice.

In the utterance of Lord Derby we have a confirmation of the statement, already made, that England has never willingly granted any measure for Ireland's advantage. Nothing but the protest of an outraged people, increased in volume by the denial of justice, and the certainty of violence even to the use of dynamite have ever gained anything for the relief of Ireland.

Daniel O'Connell, who obtained by his efforts Catholic Emancipation for the people of Great Britain, is reported to have made the following statement in a speech delivered at Cork in 1843:

"Suppose some penniless, shoeless Irishman, who made his way across the Channel on the deck of a steamer, found himself in Manchester or St. Giles (London), and collected a number of Irishmen about him—'What news?'—to which he would reply: 'Your father was cut down by a dragoon; your mother was shot by a policeman, your sister—but I will not say what has befallen

John Mitchell : the Right of Retaliation 115

her'; let this happen and I will ask Peel¹: How many fires would blaze out in the manufactories of England?"

From this and other sources we know that O'Connell was an advocate of the use of the torch under given circumstances. But he belonged to a race which had suffered for centuries both political and religious persecution inflicted with a merciless severity; consequently his moral susceptibility had been influenced greatly in the direction of peaceful agitation.

And there have been other Irishmen who were of the favored few, who were of the English race and creed, with apparently no cause or grievance in common with the mass of the Irish people; yet they have maintained the necessity for resorting to every expediency to force the English Government to give proper thought to Irish affairs.

Grievous indeed must be the wrongs of Ireland when a brave and honorable man like John Mitchell, for instance, noted for his gentleness and his kindly sympathy for the oppressed, was forced, in common with many others, to jeopardize his life for his country's cause but little over fifty years ago. After this man had suffered imprisonment and had escaped from Australia, he wrote in 1867²: "*It is not that I stand out for 'civilized' warfare, the Irish have the clear right to strike at England anywhere, and anyhow, in Canada, in Ireland, in London, by steel or gun-powder, or fire-wood*"—and if dynamite had been as available he would have been as sincere an advocate of its use. Mr. Mitchell was a Protestant and a God-fearing man.

Before the land question in Ireland can be understood and before special action can be taken to apply the means necessary to correct the present conditions we must become familiar with the views held by Isaac Butt. This writer was a member of Parliament and formerly Professor of Political

¹ Sir Robert Peel, at that time the head of the English Government.

² From an original letter in the unpublished correspondence of Col. John O'Mahoney. For copy of the letter in full, see Appendix, note 21.

Economy in the University of Dublin; consequently he was a Protestant, a circumstance whose importance should be recognized when his testimony is found adverse to the supposed interests of the property-holder and his social class, which claim in Ireland to represent the "better element." While Mr. Butt was not the first to study the subject, his views were original and must be considered in connection with those of others who have had the advantage of them in their investigations to the present time. No attempt will be made to state Mr. Butt's deductions in detail but a series of extracts will be given in his own words, as they are presented in one of his later articles relating to the history and mode of land-holding in Ireland¹:

"I propose to enforce fair dealings in matters in which the present law enables every landlord to do wrong and I propose to make it possible for the Irish tenant to feel respect for mutual rights by the indispensable preliminary of securing to him some rights of his own.

"And lastly, I deny that it is either intended or adapted to deprive the Protestant proprietors of all influence over the people.

"On the contrary, it is intended and adapted to strengthen, or rather create, their legitimate influence, by removing the bitter sources of heart-burning, hatred and discontent.

"I admit that it is intended—it is a total failure if it be not adapted—to deprive a proprietary whom your Lordship correctly designates as Protestant, of a power of dominion and coercion. It is intended to deprive the landlord, whether Protestant or Catholic, of that dominion over his tenant, which the odious power of arbitrary eviction enables him to enforce.

"I suspect very much that this subject of 'influence' or personal dominion over the people, lies at the very root of the question we are discussing and that resistance to tenant rights is far oftener a struggle to maintain a system of vassalage than an effort to preserve any right of property in land.

¹ *The Irish People and the Irish Land; a Letter to Lord Lifford*, etc., Dublin, 1867, p. 6. *Land Tenure in Ireland: a Plea for the Celtic Race and Fixity of Tenure; Heads of a Suggested Legislative Enactment*, etc., are from his pen and treat of the same subject.

“We would place the landlord, in fact, in the position of one whose father had exercised this very power under a marriage settlement and whose estate is therefore held by tenants holding by long leases at a moderate rent.

“We may, indeed, sum up all in one—we would take from him the power of arbitrary eviction.

“The circumstances of Ireland are such that this power of arbitrary eviction in the hands of the landlord gives him over his tenant a dominion compared with which the heaviest yoke of feudal vassalage was light. To evict a tenant in Ireland is, in nine instances out of ten, to reduce him to beggary—to send him to the workhouse—or to drive him from his native land. The farm he holds is the only mode in which he can exercise his industry or work for his own or his children’s bread. The man who can deprive him of this at his will and pleasure is and must be his master, by a law more absolute and exacting than that which gives the slave-owner the mastery over his slave. If there were a man whose capricious order could shut me out from the exercise of my profession without giving any reason or being called to any account, that man would be my master. The power of eviction over the Irish tenant is far more coercive. Shut out from the exercise of his profession, the tilling of the soil, the tenant whom his landlord drives out has nothing else to which he can turn. Emigration, beggary or the poor-house constitute the whole choice of the future to which he is to look. It is by no means unusual for him to make acquaintance with the bitterness of all three.

“It is a relation of pure serfdom without any of the mitigations with which old feudalism tempered the condition of the serf.

“Upon this vital point of the question no Irish landlord who has written upon the land question has touched. What is the true position of the Irish tenant who holds his farm subject to be turned out at the will and pleasure of his landlord? Is that power of eviction a mere abstract right, really exercising no influence because neither landlord nor tenant ever thinks of its being enforced? Or is it a terror constantly standing over the occupier—ever present, at least in possibility, to his mind, paralyzing his exertions and reducing him to complete dependence upon the absolute master of his fortune and his life? This is the great

question of fact which lies at the very foundation of all discussion on land tenure and upon this question every landlord advocate has been silent.

“No intelligent man can carefully read the history of Irish confiscations—can trace the effect of these confiscations upon all our social relations and realize to his own mind the light in which proprietary rights are regarded by the mass of the people and by the landlords, without coming to the conclusion that it is little short of insanity to expect peace or contentment in Ireland so long as the occupiers are kept in a position of serfdom to the owners of the soil.

“The fact that the great mass of the people are serfs to proprietors whom they regard as aliens ‘in blood, in religion, and in race,’ lies at the very root of all the miseries in Ireland. It is necessary to alter our system of land tenure, because that system has created and is perpetuating that serfdom.

“In my view, the argument for the necessity of protection to the Irish tenant may be condensed into two or three short propositions:

“First. The operation of our present system of land tenure acting on the peculiar circumstances of Ireland is to reduce the great mass of the Irish tenancy to a condition of dependence upon the landlord so complete as to be justly described as a state of serfdom.

“Second. The circumstances and conditions of Ireland, of its landed proprietors and of its people are such as to make this condition of serfdom in a large proportion of the people, one disastrous to the peace, the prosperity and the improvement of the country.

“Third. There is no rational prospect of remedying this state of things except by some legislative interference for the protection of the tenant.

“But I further believe that even were it abstractly desirable that such dominion should exist, the process by which it is attained is one which is fatal to the improvement and most injurious to the wealth of the country.

“The existence of this power involves insecurity of tenure on the part of the tenant. Insecurity of tenure makes improvement by the tenant hopeless. He will never expend his money or his

toil upon improving his farm, unless he has an assurance that he will enjoy the benefits of these improvements.

“ This is peculiarly mischievous in a country in which landlords do not let their farms in an improved state, but leave it to their tenants to supply even those permanent appliances which are absolutely necessary for the cultivation of the farm.

“ The farms in Ireland are generally let in such a state that all improvement must be effected by the industry of the tenant.

“ The want of security that he will enjoy the fruits of his industry is calculated to take away from the occupier every incentive to prudence and to thrift—to deprive him of the opportunity of exercising the habit of devoting his energies to the production of remote results instead of present enjoyment, a habit which one of the most sagacious of political economists has well described as one of the great instruments in the creation of national wealth. These are evils which follow from the existence of the power. In its practical exercise it creates more.

“ It has enabled—it is constantly enabling — wicked or tyrannical or even careless landlords, by driving out the people from their homes, to cause an amount of human suffering and misery—the extent of which in all its consequences it is not easy to estimate.

“ And it is every day enabling sordid or unprincipled landlords to seize on the property which the industry of his tenant has created—to do so, always in violation of natural justice, sometimes under circumstances of treachery and fraud.

“ If this be a correct representation of the state of things which actually exists, is it too much to say that our system of land tenure is largely responsible for the disaffection of the people?—for the hostility between classes?—for the neglected state of our resources?—for our national misery, poverty and discontent?

“ If this be the condition of the relations connected with our land tenure, the next question is—*is that condition to be permanent?* When this question is asked, I will ask again—has any man ever pointed out, can any man point out, a hope of its being altered in the present course of things, unless by a process which numbers as one of its essential conditions the extermination of the greater portion of the present occupiers of the soil?

“ Are we, the educated classes of this country, prepared to tell

the Irish people that Ireland is no place for them to live in? Are you, the landlords of Ireland, ready to make to the people this avowal? Is the English Government ready to venture on this declaration, one without precedent in the history of governments? Another question still remains—is it to be expected that the Irish people, ‘the Celtic Race,’¹ will tamely submit to a law which dooms them to extermination from their native land?—will impartial history hereafter say that they ought?

“The truth is, that the condition of land tenure in Ireland has not for the last two centuries been in a natural state. It is not so now. A country, of which the landed property was tossed as a prey to be scrambled for by ‘adventurers’ and ‘soldiers who claimed arrears of pay,’ had its whole system of land tenure violently disturbed from its natural course. That disturbance has never yet settled down.

“The provisions of the settlement which intended to prevent the very state of things which has arisen, were wholly neglected and set at naught. Other causes have perpetuated to the present day the disturbing influences of confiscation and conquest. Want of means on the part of new possessors have prevented them from putting their estates in order. The degradation of the old population enabled them to use that population as slaves. Their successors were all brought up to disregard the obligations on the faith of which they held their estates. Seven generations of these proprietors have passed away without effecting any improvement on their estates. All that has been done in the way of improvement has been done by the industry and labour of the occupiers of the soil. The instances in which this is not the case have been so few as to constitute no appreciable exception to the rule. The worst of all is that the evils of the state following on conquest and confiscation have become chronic. A serfdom has grown up, which, if we do not interfere with it, will forever perpetuate itself. To get rid of it we must go back to the beginning and undo, if necessary with a strong hand, the neglects and the errors which attended the original settlement of a new proprietary

¹ “I have been taken to task for speaking of the occupiers as constituting the Celtic race. They do so—mingled as they are in blood with the Saxon—the great mass of the Irish population still represent in religion, in feeling, in habits and in race, the old inhabitants of the land.”—ISAAC BUTT, *loc. cit.*

in the country. I will show you presently that it is only necessary to enforce against the representatives of these proprietors a *bonâ fide* observance of the conditions of their grants.

“Conviction has been forced upon the minds of all men that there must be some legislative interference with the system of land tenure in Ireland.

“Our experience of human nature tells us that in all the relations of life, the characters and conduct of men are moulded and formed by the circumstances in which they are placed. There is in the Irish gentry an hereditary distrust of the Irish people. They are taught from their youth up to believe in ‘Irish contempt of law, and the rights of property.’ The people reciprocate the hostile feelings of the gentry. . . . It is enough to say that this mutual estrangement and distrust exists. . . . Judging by the feelings with which they regard each other, I believe the Irish proprietor to be altogether unfitted—if, indeed, any man could be fit—to exercise the dominion of vassalage over the Irish people.

“This, I am satisfied, is the true view of the question. Is it right, or just, or expedient that the representatives of the titles of confiscation and conquest should be absolute masters of the Irish people? The attempt to make them so lies at the root of all our distraction and discontent. There never will be, there never can be peace in Ireland until we sever from the right of property in land the right to hold in a state of serfdom the occupiers of that land.

“There is no conceivable object of ambition, of fanaticism, or of passion for which the dominion of the landlord has not been used. From the coercion of a vote at an election down to purposes the basest and the most unholy, there is nothing within the range of the follies, the lusts, or the evil passions of power, in respect to which some Irish tenant has not felt the iron hand of tyranny press heavily upon him.

“What I do mean to assert is that, legally, the landlord has a power which amounts to absolute coercion over his tenants. All the restraining influences which may act upon him, are, in many instances insufficient to control the exercise of that power. In no instance are they sufficient to assure the tenant that it will not be put forth to accomplish his destruction.

“We have had experience of actual evictions! But is there a man in Ireland who does not know how they have been used? Have they been used ruthlessly to sweep away the population which was likely to become a burden by swelling the poor rates on an estate? Have they been used to drive out the honest and industrious tenant, at the call of his landlord’s interest or caprice? In how many instances have they been used and are they used to rob the widow and orphan of the little property which the husband and the father had created in improvements on his farm? If your Lordship, or any truthful man, will tell me that these things are not done, then I will believe that I have exaggerated the evils of the power of eviction, etc.

“Is it possible for men placed in the position of the Irish farmer to be industrious? How many tenant farmers in Ireland can walk out this day into their fields and dig the trench that is to drain the morass or turn up the soil of the uncultivated hill-side and feel that they are toiling for themselves? The result of insecurity of tenure is that our fields are half cultivated and our land unimproved. This is no light matter in a country like Ireland, where so much is yet to be done in the way of improvement and where, as a general rule, the landlord does nothing. In such a country the man who has the occupation of the soil must be the improver; and therefore, if you have improvements at all, you must give to the occupier such a tenure as will enable him to improve.

“‘With the consent of the landlord!’ How hard it is for the best of men to bring themselves to give up arbitrary power!

“The industry of the tenant can gradually carry cultivation to the hill-top—it can, by slow and imperceptible degrees, reduce the watery bottom to the rich and luxuriant meadow—it can, by constant and unflagging attention turn the waste land, bit by bit, into a potato ridge, until, in the process of years, the whole becomes a corn-field. These changes and changes like these are the improvements by which, gradually and in almost unnoticed steps, the industry of the occupier might convert all Ireland into a garden. To forbid changes like these unless they are mapped out and planned for the specific and special assent of the landlord beforehand, is simply to prohibit them.

“The occupier who cannot do all this and do it with the cer-

tainty that if he does do it, he himself and not another shall reap where he has sown, is debarred by the wickedness and folly of human law from making the most of God's earth for the benefit of all the creatures of God.

"The rights of property which are destructive of national welfare cannot be maintained.

"Is the present state of things to last forever? Are successive generations of Irishmen to waste and wear away their lives, as we have done the best of ours, amid the distractions and miseries of an impoverished country—impoverished because its energies are preyed on by the slow fever of servile war? Have we no better inheritance to leave our children?

"Are the people to leave the country to the landlords?

"Are the landlords to leave it to the people?

"Or, are we, by some bold and fearless measure, to reconcile the people to proprietary rights by making proprietary rights consistent with their living in freedom and happiness in their native land?

"I cannot help saying, my Lord, that if the only choice were between the second and the third—if we were driven to the alternative that either the people should abandon the country to the landlords or the landlords give it up to the people—the 'Fenian' view of the question appears to me of the two the more reasonable and just.

"All property, especially all property inland, is the creation of the State. The monopoly of the surface of the earth, which confers the power on any proprietor of shutting me out from walking over the mountain or the moor, rests upon no national right. It is an arrangement of society which is justified because such an appropriation is necessary to enable the land to be most profitably used for the benefit of all. But there is no proprietary right in the land which excludes the rights of the whole community to have the land of the country made useful to the national wealth. No wise statesman, indeed, would venture to legislate so as to prevent every possible case of misuse or abuse of proprietary right. I admit that there are limits, within which, in civilized society, every land-owner should be permitted to do what he liked with his own, even though he may like to do that which is very wrong. There is, however, a case in which the necessity

and the right of legislation are patent—whenever the abuse of proprietary right is such or so general as to become a public mischief and wrong.

“I am within this principle when I propose to enact that no proprietor shall be permitted to let his land at a rental higher than the fair letting value, or for a tenure shorter than sixty-three years. I believe in the perfect right of the State to impose these conditions upon all owners of landed property, if the necessity for imposing them be made out.

“In the case of the Irish proprietors I do not need to resort to these general principles. The very conditions which I think may reasonably be insisted on by legislation are already incorporated with the titles to many, if not most, of their estates. The original grants contained stipulations intended for the express purpose of preventing the state of things which has now arisen—stipulations by which the land-owners are bound never to place on their estates a tenantry holding by a short and precarious tenure.

“I have in my former tract (*Land Tenure in Ireland*, etc., 3d edition, p. 73) endeavored to show that all Irish proprietors held their estates in such a manner as to create an implied trust to use their proprietary rights in a manner with which their present system is entirely inconsistent. In this respect the condition of the Irish proprietor differs from that of the proprietors of every country with the history of which I am acquainted. We can positively say of most all the grants of land which have been made in Ireland since the accession of James I., that they were made for the express purpose and upon the express condition of placing on the estate so granted a loyal and a peaceful and a contented population. The proprietors have in scarcely any instance carried out the purpose or fulfilled the condition. That which can be positively shown by the grants of James I. and of Cromwell, may with almost equal certainty be stated of the earlier grants of Elizabeth. But even those which have been made since the beginning of the seventeenth century cover almost the entire island. These circumstances distinguished property in Irish land from similar property in all other countries.

“The grantee received his estates for the purpose of reclaiming hostile or unsettled districts to the service of the English sovereign. He was expressly told that the lands he was receiving

were wild and uncivilized wastes and that no man must take them for the purposes only of private profit, but for the good of the commonwealth. He was to civilize and subdue his possessions before he could enjoy them. . . . No one dealing with the land question in this country ought to overlook the fact that almost all Irish estates have been granted for purposes which are public ones, which involve in fact public trusts, trusts which affect the interests, the peace and the well-being of the whole community, both of Ireland and England—and that up to this time these trusts have not been carried out and these purposes have not been fulfilled.

“There are few portions of Irish history upon which we possess information as clear or as accurate as that which throws light upon the plantation of Ulster by the first King James. Papers are in existence said to be drawn by the King’s own hand, containing the project of this plantation. In a paper printed in the year 1608, after a recital:

“‘That the greatest part of six counties, in the Province of Ulster, within the realm of Ireland named Armagh, Coleraine, Donegal, Fermanagh, and Cavan had “escheated” and come to the Crown and latterly been surveyed and the survey presented to his Majesty.’

“It is declared that ‘his Majesty:

“‘Not regarding his own profit but the public peace and welfare of this Kingdom by a civil plantation of these unreformed and waste countries, is graciously pleased to distribute the said lands to such of his subjects as well of Great Britain as of Ireland, as being of merit, and ability, shall seek the same with a mind not only to benefit themselves, *but to do service to the Crown and Commonwealth.*’¹

“The paper then proceeds to complain of:

“‘Importunate suitors for greater portions than they are able to plant intending *their private profit only and not the advancement of the public service.*’

¹ “Orders and Conditions to be Observed by the Undertakers upon the Distribution and Plantation of the Escheated Lands in Ulster.” From a copy printed in the year 1608. Harris’s *Hibernica*, p. 123. See also the same document in *A Concise View of the Origin, Constitution and Proceedings of the Irish Society*, printed by order of the Court, London, 1822.

“ King James would scarcely have recognized in one of his patentees a right ‘to do what he liked with his own, . . . intending his own private profit only and not the advancement of the public service.’ But the matter was not left to any general recital, very stringent terms were imposed upon the grantee. The lands were divided in certain proportions between the English and Scotch undertakers, Irish servitors, or servants of the Crown and Irish natives.

“ ‘ The persons of the undertakers shall be of three sorts:

“ ‘ First. English and Scotch, as well servitors as others, who are to plant their portion with English, or inland Scotch inhabitants.

“ ‘ Second. Servitors in the Kingdom of Ireland, who may take mere Irish, English, or inland Scottish tenants, at their choice.

“ ‘ Third. Natives of Ireland, who are to be made freeholders.’

“ It is very singular that from the first two classes these regulations required the taking the oath of supremacy and ‘to be conformable in religion.’ In the case of the Irish natives these conditions were omitted—the only condition of a political nature imposed upon them being:

“ ‘ A proviso for the forfeiture of their estates, if they entered into actual rebellion.’

“ But it is to this that I desire to call attention—that in every paper ever published, from the earliest inception of the project upon every class of grantees one condition was invariably imposed.

“ Of the English and Scotch undertakers it is declared: ‘ The said undertakers shall not demise any part of their lands at will only, but shall make certain estates for years, for life, in tail, or in fee-simple.’

“ Of the Irish servitors—grantees who had been in the service of the Crown:

“ ‘ They shall make certain estates to their tenants and at certain rents and forbear Irish exactions.’

“ Of the Irish natives:

“ ‘ They shall make certain estates for lives or years to their under-tenants, and shall take no Irish exactions.’ ”

Mr. Butt quotes from Carte’s *Life of Ormond* (vol. i., p.

73), an interesting document, which is also given by Leland and other Irish historians, in which the final conditions of the plantation are accurately summed up. The following provision is directly connected with the subject under consideration:

"They were not to alienate any of their lands without royal license, NOR SET THEM AT UNCERTAIN RENTS, OR FOR A LESS TERM THAN FOR TWENTY-ONE YEARS, OR THREE LIVES, etc. . . . In this manner and under these regulations were the escheated lands in Ulster disposed of to a hundred and four English and Scotch undertakers, fifty-six servitors, and two hundred and eighty-six natives, all which gave bond to the government for performance of covenants ; for the better assurance whereof, the King required a regular account to be sent him from the state, of the progress made by each undertaker in that province."

Mr. Butt shows that reports were made to the King and gives a detailed account of a report of a Commission or Visitation made in November, 1618. He also shows how the Irish grantees were forced out of the lands which had been allotted to them.

In his continued consideration of the subject the statement is made that:

"The late Mr. Sharman Crawford pointed out that the custom of the Ulster tenant right was originally permitted by the grantee of the Ulster plantation in lieu of the fixed and settled tenures which they were bound by their patents to give to their tenantry, but the granting of which they had evaded.

There doubtless exists some good foundation for this explanation as to the origin of the "Ulster tenant rights." But the impression generally accepted is the one given elsewhere, that the measure originated in the Irish Parliament at a time when many of the large land-holders out of Ulster were Catholics and after these had been dispossessed and the tenantry become largely Catholic, all tenant rights were

forgotten except in some portions of Ulster. It is also shown that the highest legal authorities in England have decided that the laws in relation to "tenant rights" were equally applicable or operative in every portion of Ireland; but the English Government with its usual spirit of partiality in favor of the landlord interest, has caused the judgment to remain inoperative.

Mr. Butt writes:

"It would be a great mistake to suppose that the grants of King James were confined to the province of Ulster. They were made largely in Langford, in Westmeath, in Kildare and in Wicklow. In all these counties the conditions correspond with those of the Ulster plantation."

It is not necessary to trace at greater length the efforts which, it is claimed, were made by the Government in other portions of Ireland to protect the tenants who were chiefly Irish and who had been driven out of some other section. The statement is made by Mr. Butt that:

"In every project for the 'plantation' of any part of Ireland the same provision was made for the 'meer Irish.' In the Elizabethan plantation of Munster they were freely mixed with the English settlers.

"In King James's plantation of Ulster they were relegated to separate districts or attached to separate estates.

"In 'the Cromwellian settlement' it was proposed to banish them to a province almost exclusively awarded them.

"Every provision for them was thwarted by *the rapacity of those who practically administered Irish affairs*; and the old Irish Catholic people, contrary to the terms of every settlement, were kept as serfs upon the lands which had been allotted to Protestant proprietors upon the express terms of planting them with independent settlers.

"The old proprietors were forever deprived of the portions of land which were reserved to them by the policy of James. Even Cromwell's provision of Connaught was not left to the miserable victims of wrong. In the acts of settlement and explanation

many of the 'innocent Papists,' that is Roman Catholics who had adhered to King Charles, were cheated out of the lands in Connaught which had been allotted to them in compensation for the estates which they had lost by their loyalty to the King.

"I cannot pass from this subject without observing that, with respect to the plantation of Ulster, a very great injustice has been done to the memory of King James. We must carefully distinguish, in tracing Irish history, between the intention of the English sovereign and the mode in which the orders of the sovereign were carried out by the *rapacity and venality* of those to whom the execution of the plans was entrusted. . . . I am now speaking of the original project of King James. *It never was a part of his plan to exterminate the native population.*¹

"If it be conceded, as it must be, that in the early days of these grants—those who held them were amenable to the visitation and control of the British Crown in respect to the tenure

¹ If the English Government could be excused from responsibility for the acts committed "by the rapacity of those who practically administered Irish affairs," the writer would feel that he himself has been most uncharitable. But in all relations of life the principal is responsible for all acts of an agent wherever a misdeed could have been prevented by proper supervision. Extenuating circumstances might be held to excuse a single occurrence but where the evidence is continuous in proof of the misdeeds due to "the rapacity of those who practically administered Irish affairs," and the same has continued for five or six hundred years, the only deduction which can be drawn is in proof of collusion between principal and agent.

Those who are familiar with the mode of administering the government in Ireland would never believe that an Irish official would dare inaugurate any line of action, at variance with the established routine of office, without instruction from the Irish Secretary at "the Castle"; the latter in turn must act only in accord with the policy of the Minister then at the head of the English Government, whose appointee he is. It is even claimed on good grounds that the policy of the English Government towards Ireland has undergone no change in centuries—the established policy being always to the detriment of the majority of the Irish people.

Both James and his son Charles may have been deceived, as they doubtless were in many instances, regarding the political condition in Ireland and both should in charity receive the benefit of every doubt; but in many instances proof is not wanting that the rendering of justice to the Irish people was not always their purpose. They were both "thrifty" and it is inconceivable that they would never have remained ignorant of their agents' course if historical facts were reversed and the revenues from their Irish property had been lessened.

they created on these lands—surely it cannot be said that this right of visitation and control is gone as long as the land-owner depends upon the British Crown for force to protect him in his rights. It never can be forgotten, it cannot be too often repeated, that all proprietary rights in Ireland are upheld solely by the military power of England. It is vain for those whose rights are thus upheld to claim the extreme privileges which may or may not belong to landed property in countries where that property is held by a tenure depending upon the influence existing in the country itself. Ireland is the only country in Europe in which proprietary rights in land are upheld by foreign bayonets.

“ ‘Landlordism’ in Ireland has been maintained and is maintained by a positive money cost to the British Crown, of which it is not easy to reckon the sum. . . . Since the restoration of Charles II., the defence of landlordism in Ireland has drained it of hundreds of thousands—if I add the loss of revenue from Ireland, it is draining it of millions,—every year. It is lowering and weakening England in both hemispheres of the globe. It is vain to disguise it. Ireland is the weakness of England and foreign nations know it as well as we do ourselves. Irish ‘Landlordism’ is hanging like a millstone around the neck of England and dragging her down from her once proud position in the Commonwealth of Europe.¹

“ From that serfdom the occupiers of the soil of Ireland have never been raised. I know of no historical deduction more clear than that which traces year by year the perpetuation of its evil influences to the present day. The calm and philosophic judgment of the late Sir George Lewis thus described the state of the Irish occupiers of the soil.

“ In his work on *Irish Disturbances and the Irish Church Question*, after pointing out the evils produced by grants to an ab-

¹ This statement should not pass without challenge. The landlord system as it exists in Ireland is not itself the cause of the sufferings of the people but is one of the results naturally attending the confiscation and holding of a country by a foreign nation, throughout centuries, without becoming identified with the country's interests and without effort to conciliate the vast majority of the people. Ireland has been held in bondage for the gain and profit of the English garrison-holders, who have long since sapped the “body politic” of its life-blood.

sentee, who was represented either by an agent or 'middleman,' he proceeds:

" 'The landlord, if resident and an Irishman, was almost invariably a Protestant, as Catholics were incapacitated from holding land; and as in the three southern provinces nearly all the tenants were Catholics, the landlord exercised over his tenant, not only that influence which a creditor necessarily exercises over his debtor, but also that power which the law gave to a Protestant over the Catholic, to the magistrate and grand juror over the suspected rebel.

" 'Deprived of all self-respect by the operation of the penal statutes, deprived from rising in the world or from bettering their condition by legal disabilities, excluded from a public participation in the rites of their own religion, they endured all and more than the evils which belonged to the lot of a serf without looking forward to the interested protection and relief which a master would afford his bondsman.' "

Mr. Butt also quotes from Arthur Young's *Tour in Ireland*, 1776:

" 'It must be very apparent to every traveller throughout that country that the labouring poor are treated with harshness and are in all respects so little considered that their want of importance seems a perfect contrast to their situation in England. . . . *The landlord of an Irish estate inhabited by Roman Catholics is a sort of despot who yields obedience in whatever concerns the poor to no law but that of his will.* . . . A landlord in Ireland can scarcely invent an order which a servant, labourer, or cottar dares to refuse to execute. Nothing satisfies him but unlimited submission. Disrespect or anything tending towards sauciness he may punish with his cane or his horsewhip with the most perfect security, a poor man would have his bones broken if he offered to lift his hand in his own defense. Knocking down is spoken of in the country in a manner that makes an Englishman stare. Landlords of consequence have assured me that many of their cottars would think themselves honoured by having their wives and daughters sent for to the bed of their masters; a mark of slavery that proves the oppression under which such people must live.' "

Mr. Butt refers to this statement in a note as follows :

“ I am sure that this representation if applied to the manners of the people generally was untrue. This does not affect the testimony of Arthur Young. It was the statement to him ‘ OF LANDLORDS OF CONSEQUENCE.’ The more mistaken they were the more fearful is the testimony to the terrible vassalage in which ‘ their cottars ’ were held. Even in our own day we have seen the terrors of serfdom almost as cruelly crush down the feelings, upon the existence of which in our peasantry we take most pride. No one will deny this who will read the dismal story of the murder of the poor outcast boy.¹ After all, while human nature is what it is, to give absolute power is to insure its abuse.

“ In the year 1809 Ireland was travelled over by Mr. Edward Wakefield, a gentleman who came to the country for the purpose of informing himself and writing on its state. His work supplies a curious comparison with the account which Arthur Young gives of the country only thirty years before. In other respects there is a dismal sameness in the description of the degradation of the people. At this period the exaction of work from the tenant at a low rate of wages appears to have been universal. Throughout a great portion of Ireland the leases bound the tenant to work for the landlord whenever he called on him, frequently at less than half remuneration. The oppression he describes as connected with this practice proves more forcibly than any general account, the serfdom of the people.”

He quotes from Wakefield's *Account of Ireland*, vol. i., p. 510:

“ ‘ They are paid only six pence a day for their labour, and seldom obtain a settlement in less than six months. By the terms of their leases they are obliged to work as many days as will pay their rent and when they have accomplished this it is difficult to get them at all; for if they worked at home their landlord would see them and order them to their demesnes, so that they must remain idle or work for their landlords for the paltry sum of six pence a day.

¹ Narrative given in the Appendix, note 22.

“ Duties ” Extortion by Irish Landlords 133

“ ‘ A poor man who enjoys these “ conveniences ” as they are called, would be thought a rebel did he not abandon his own crops to gather in that of his master; and if to this be added the duty fowl, the duty turf, and, in short, the duty in general, which is but another term for personal service, it will be seen to what extent this kind of slavery is carried in Ireland. ’ (Vol. i. p. 599.)

“ ‘ The leases granted by Lord Belmore obliged his tenants to work with their horses and cars a certain number of days in the year, especially at the season of cutting turf! ’ (Vol. i., p. 259.)

“ ‘ The landlord to get in his crop, cart his turf, thrash his oats or accomplish any other work, obliges his tenant to neglect his own occupation in order that he may perform his labour at a fixed rate of payment, which is always less than that which he pays to a person who does not reside under him. ’ ” (Vol. i., p. 507.)

A quotation is then given from Mr. Charles Coote’s survey of Monaghan :

“ ‘ The beggarly system of extorting duties from tenants is so shamefully reprehensible in this enlightened age, that it is surprising to see such claims still insisted on in leases. It is not on such paltry considerations that men of rank and fortune should hold their superiority.

“ ‘ A still more grievous oppression was resorted to in connection with these penal rents. The “ duties ” were not demanded. The “ receipts ” were not demanded. The receipts were passed for the ordinary rents, without mentioning the duties; and the penal rents were afterwards enforced. ’ ”

Mr. Butt states :

“ Not only were duty days exacted in addition to the rent, but conditions which made the landlord almost the pilferer of the cottier’s small store of poultry, were rigidly enforced. The lease always reserved a high penal rent if these petty robberies were not submitted to. ‘ In consequence of the service required by this clause being neglected, I have seen, ’ writes Wakefield (vol. i., p. 245), ‘ a poor man’s cattle taken from his door, and driven away without the least expression of feeling or regret. ’ But the

exactions were not confined to those which were authorized by an instrument, miscalled a lease, in reality the covenant by which the bondsman sold himself to his landlord. Agents and landlords insisted on the tenant working for them for nothing and vengeance followed those who disobeyed the hint that such gratuitous labour would be acceptable to their lord. In other respects a system of fleecing the tenantry was pursued in comparison with which the oppressions and exactions of the Turkish tax gatherer upon the Christian subjects of the Porte are not very tyrannical.

“So long as there was no obligation on property to provide for poverty, many of the land-owners never troubled themselves about the sub-division of farms; they let cottiers multiply, because cottiers swelled their rents. When there was a prospect of a poor law some of the most prudent, or the most hard-hearted, began to clear their estates. . . . To this hour one of the actuating motives with the proprietary class in refusing leases is to keep the occupiers so entirely under their control that they may prevent the settling on the land of a single human being who may afterwards, by possibility, come upon the rates.

“Hence, too, many of the restrictions which it seems at first sight a mere capricious tyranny to impose upon Irish tenantry at will.

“When we read of a widow lady being evicted because she brought a widowed daughter to reside in her house—of ‘rules of the estate’ which punish, with eviction, any tenant who marries, or permits any of his family to marry, without a written license from the agent—of injunction enforced by the penalties of eviction, that two families should never live under the same roof—of rules made peremptory on all tenants that they should not harbour a visitor or lodger—of stern decrees which prohibit them from giving a night’s shelter to a homeless wanderer, we at first regard these things as the mere caprices of a wanton and objectless tyranny.¹

“This was the state of the peasant in many districts of Ireland in 1810. It is really unjust to refer the difficulties to the land-owners, to the influence of the owners of property. It is vain to distinguish between the acts of owners in fee and their agents, or their middlemen. For the acts of the agent the landlord was

¹ See Appendix, note 21.

The Perennial Cause of Ireland's Misery 135

strictly responsible; but all the oppressions that were practised upon the occupiers by any class were only possible from the miserable slavery by which the people were crushed.

“There is and there must be one cause always existing and always unchanged, which is always creating misery and discontent. What is it? What is that something which existed in 1727 and which exists in 1867—which blighted Ireland in the days of Swift as it is blighting Ireland now?—which armed the Levellers in 1760 as it has armed the Fenians of the present day? Through how many changes has Ireland passed? How many political disabilities have been removed? Yet there is one discontent and one misery ‘in all the changes’ of our national existence unremoved and unchanged. There must be some unchanged and unchanging cause. It was not excessive agricultural population that created the evil in the days of Swift. The misery was then as it is now. All restrictions upon the woollen trade have been removed for nearly a century. It cannot be these restrictions which create it. Among the varying grievances of Ireland—in all the changing complaints of political and social and commercial injustice—there is one constant evil that meets us, always unchanged and unchangeable—the ‘perennial’ cause of a ‘perennial’ desolation. The perpetual origin of misery and degradation has been the fact that the great mass of the people have been treated as belonging to a conquered race. All legislative and administrative efforts have been to secure the position of the land-owners, to protect them against the people and to enable them to raise as much as they can from the serfs that were located on their estates. No effort has been made to elevate or improve the condition of the occupiers. In a country of which the dominant caste consists of those who hold their properties by a title of confiscation, it is not, perhaps, surprising that the rights of property have been religiously, or rather irreligiously, upheld—the rights of industry and labour blighted, and no account taken of the first and most sacred right of all rights—the right of the Irish people to live in their native land.”

CHAPTER IX

THE LAND LEAGUE AND THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE

IN 1882 a little work by Philip H. D. Bagenal was reprinted in Boston from the London edition. Mr. Bagenal has made an honest effort to present his subject in strict accord with the truth, so far as his loyalty as a British subject and his sympathies with the English Government would permit. In tracing the origin and advance of the Land League Movement he states¹:

“There is nothing new under the sun and the organization of the Land League is no exception to the wise man’s aphorism.

“Like all other national movements, the anti-rent agitation and the no-rent combination are the children of a by-gone generation. To James Finton Lalor the leaders of the Land League owe their inspiration, and their action was successful because they received sufficient pecuniary aid from America to make them formidable at the very moment when, from reasons best known to themselves, the English Government were unwilling to crush an incipient revolution.

“From the first, James Finton Lalor had one grand idea upon the land question, which if properly carried out, he maintained, would revolutionize Ireland and reconquer the ‘land for the

¹ *The American Irish and their Influence on Irish Politics*, Boston, 1882, p. 149. Allibone, in the supplement to his *Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, etc., quotes: “He is a strong opponent of Mr. Gladstone’s Irish policy, yet his own volume is in effect, if not in intention, a terrible indictment against English rule in Ireland.”—*Spectator*, vol. lv., p. 897. This work will be utilized chiefly for some of the material he has quoted, which the writer could only thus obtain at second hand.

people.' This was, briefly, the refusal of all rent and the resistance of the service of the Queen's writs.

"In the first number of the *Irish Felon*, June 24, 1848, Lalor's first paper appeared, stating the principles which ought to guide Irish revolutionists in the future. . . . 'I hold and maintain that the entire soil of a country belongs of right to the entire people of that country and is the rightful property not of one class but of the nation at large, in full effective possession, to let to whom they will on whatsoever tenures, terms, rent service and conditions they will; one condition being, however, unavoidable and essential—the condition that the tenant shall bear full time and undivided fealty and allegiance to the nation and the laws of the nation whose lands he holds and owe no allegiance whatsoever to any other prince, power, or people, or any obligation of obedience or respect to their will, order, or laws.'

(Page 153): "'The right of property may be pleaded. No one has a higher respect for the real rights of property than I have; but I do not class among them the robber right by which the lands of this county are now held in fee from the British Crown. I acknowledge no right of property in a small class which goes to abrogate the rights of a numerous people. I acknowledge no rights of property in eight thousand persons, be they noble or ignoble, which takes away all rights of property, security, independence and existence itself from a population of eight millions, and stands in bar to all the political rights of the island and all the social rights of its inhabitants. I acknowledge no right of property which takes the food of millions and gives them a famine—which denies to the peasant the right of a home, and concedes in exchange, the right of a work-house. I deny and challenge all such rights, however founded or enforced. I challenge them as founded only in the Code of the Brigand and enforced only by the sanction of the hangman. Against them I assert the true and indefeasible right of property—the right of the people to have this land and possess it; and to live in it by their own labor, on their own land as God and nature meant them to do, etc.'

(Page 159): "After regretting that this method of revolution was not adopted by the young Ireland party which formed the confederation, upon which Lalor had pressed it as the only means of effecting a successful insurrection, he continues: 'The opinions

I then stated, and which I yet stand firm to, are these: 1. That in order to save their own lives, the occupying tenants of the soil of Ireland ought next autumn to refuse all rent and arrears of rent then due, beyond and except the value of the overplus of harvest produce remaining in their hands, after having deducted and reserved a due and full provision for their own subsistence during the next twelve months. 2. That they ought to refuse and resist being made beggars, landless and homeless, under the English law of ejectment. 3. That they ought further, *on principle*, to refuse *all* rent to the present usurping proprietors (or Lords paramount in legal parlance) have in national congress or convention decided what rents they are to pay, and to whom they are to pay them. 4. And that the people, on grounds of policy and economy, ought to decide that those rents shall be paid to themselves, the people, for public purposes and for behoof and benefit of them, the entire people.' . . . After explaining to greater length his views, Lalor concludes: 'I want to put Ireland foremost in the van of the world, at the head of the nations; to set her aloft in the blaze of the sun and to make her for ages a load-star of history. Will she take the path I point out—the path to be free and famed, and feared and followed, the path that goes sunward? Or onward to the end of time will wretched Ireland ever come limping and lagging hindmost?' That question has been answered in the year 1880, and the path that James Finton Lalor pointed out has been found to lead to the jail and not to glory. How his program was carried out by another generation of conspirators, I will narrate in a succeeding chapter.

"Such were the doctrines of James Finton Lalor upon the Land Question in 1848. They were fully adopted in the next great revolutionary movement in Ireland in principle, but Stephens only looked upon the land question as a matter to be decided when the great battle of Irish independence had been fought and won. Lalor, on the other hand, from the first saw that the land was the most effective weapon to win that battle, and his remarkable scheme, excavated from its obscurity in America and worked by the Land League, had, in fact, brought the whole question of the repeal of the union once more before the world." (Page 176): "But the most important point of the new policy was the declaration of an organized, steady and persistent effort to get possession

of the local bodies throughout Ireland. The municipal bodies, the Boards of Guardians, the farmers' and tenants' clubs, all these were to be honey-combed with revolution; and with the majority of these in their possession, the leaders of the movement believed they could do much, which in January, 1879, they could scarcely dream of. . . . The only plan worthy of support was to form a common platform which would bind all who advocate 'self-government,' withholding a definition of the word until the country itself should speak in a manner to command the allegiance of all. So much for the new scheme for a coalition of Irish parties. By far the most important part of the manifesto, in view of the land-and-labor agitation, which it preceded, was the section upon the land question. . . . No party or combination of parties in Ireland can ever hope to win the support of the majority of the people except it *honestly proposes a radical reform of the Land System*. No matter what may be said in favor of individual landlords, the whole system was founded on robbery and fraud, and had been perpetuated by cruelty, injustice, extortion, and hatred of the people. The men who got small farms in the time of confiscation settled down in the country, and their descendants, no matter what their political party, are now 'bone of our bone'—have become Irish—and perform a useful function in the land. No one thinks of disturbing them. If the landlords had become Irish, and treated the people with humanity, the original robberies might be forgiven—though a radical change in the tenure of land must come of itself some day; but when as a class they have simply done England's work of rooting out the Irish people; when the history of landlordism is simply a dark story of heartless cruelty, of artificial famines, of evictions, of rags and squalid misery, there is no reason why we should forget that the system was forced upon us by England and that the majority of the present landlords are the inheritors of a robber horde sent over by Elizabeth and James I., by Cromwell and William of Orange, to garrison the country for England. It is the interest of Ireland that *the land should be owned by those who till the soil*, and this could be reached without even inflicting hardship on those who deserve no leniency at the hands of the Irish people. A solution of the Land Question has been reached to a large extent in France, in Prussia and in Belgium, by enabling the

occupants to purchase their holdings. *Let the Irish landlords be given a chance of settling the Irish land question amicably in this manner, or wait for a solution in which they shall have no part.* . . . To those who are alarmed at language like this, in regard to the Land Question, I would say, look at France, at Prussia and Belgium, and you will find that the secret of their prosperity lies in the numbers of the tillers of the soil who own their holdings. Listen to the mutterings of the coming storm in *England* and ask yourselves what is going to become of the land monopoly after a few more years of commercial or manufacturing depression, a depression sure to continue because the causes of it are on the increase.

“The English are a very practical and very selfish people, and will not let any fine sentiment stand in the way when they think it is their interest to re-distribute the land. What, may I ask, would become of the Irish landlords—especially the rack-renting, evicting ones—in *case of a social convulsion in England*? It is a question which they themselves must decide within the next few years. With them or without them the question will be settled before long, and many who now think the foregoing assertions extravagant, will consider them very moderate indeed, by and by.

“Here, then, was the engine, ready made, which would generate its own steam, and to which was to be hereafter linked the question of separation from England. The fire was kindled by Davitt and he found the sparks for the first kindling in the West of Ireland. For some months while the Home Rule party was luxuriating in the pleasure of private quarrels and public discussions, Davitt was busily engaged in taking up the broken threads of the old Fenian conspiracy, and organizing the new departure in Irish practical politics, etc.

(Page 183): “The great end in view, from the very commencement of the plot, was to arouse the worst feeling of the agricultural population against the landlord. To bind the public, however, and especially the landlords, the ostensible reasons at first thrown out for the anti-rent agitation were the agricultural distress and the fears of a bad harvest which was dexterously and emphatically prophesied. But soon the work was thrown off; the true key-note of the new revolutionary conspiracy was boldly

struck, and the motto at every extreme land meeting in the West was the 'Land for the People.' The cry was taken up throughout Ireland. Mr. Parnell stoutly preached the doctrine of repudiation of contract and advocated the disestablishment and disendowment of the landlord classes loudly, and ably assisted by Michael Davitt. As the movement grew stronger and stronger, ecclesiastical influence was boldly and openly resisted on the public platform and the whole agitation culminated in the foundation by Davitt of the enormous vigilance committee, known under the name of the National Land League, and the revolution of the national Convention Committee, deciding to assemble in the course of a year a national convcnction of the Irish people. Such was the commencement of the anti-landlord agitation in Ireland."

Mr. Bagenal traces at length from his standpoint the efforts of Mr. Parnell and others for the development of the Land League and the Home Rule movement in the following terms¹:

"Let, us, however, for a moment pause and analyze the social condition of Ireland as now exhibited. The masses of the people are still heaving under the revolutionary agitation of the three preceding years. They have imbibed all the newest theories of the most fanciful American writers and thinkers upon social subjects. They have seen the government of the country conducted upon a system of aphorisms and they have accordingly accepted aphorisms as their own rule of life and conduct. 'Property is robbery,' 'interest for money is theft,' and 'rent is an immoral tax,'—these are the branches of the new popular upas tree.

"Moreover, the influence of the clergy has been flouted and discarded as it never has been before in the history of the country. . . . A system of terror and chicane has superseded the law of the land. The whole of the agricultural population have with one consent united for the purpose of resisting the process of the law and plundering those to whom they were indebted. Anarchy and terrorism and outrage upon man and beast have been for eighteen months universal. Irish women have forgotten all

¹ P. 232.

decency and modesty, and have stripped men naked on the highway flogging them with whin-brushes. Judges of assize have inveighed in every province against crime. Parliament has endeavored to coerce illegal associations. The executive Government has filled the jails with suspected persons.

“But all has been of no avail. The revolution has never been checked. The floodgates have been lifted up so high that everything opposing the rushing torrent of agrarian democracy has been swept away. One stops aghast, and asks what and where are the forces to compel attention and rescue an unhappy country from the suffering and demoralization of another upheaval? Class has been set against class with a bitterness and eager assiduity which finds no parallel since the French Revolution. The press teems with misrepresentations and false deductions from new and unheard of principles. What used to be axioms of property are now denied or disputed. The shop-windows are full of caricatures bringing all that is above the mob down to their own level—and, as is well known, the low is with the populace the sublime. The gentry and aristocracy have been hounded down personally and persistently. Sport has ceased and in its place lawless mobs sweep the country side, killing everything before them, sometimes prevented from bursting into private demesnes by armed bodies of soldiers and police. Trade and enterprise have entirely ceased, and a well-known Dublin manufacturer, in the daily press, deplored the loss and decay of the Irish manufactures.¹ The land-owning and land-occupying classes are engaged in an endless and expensive system of litigation, which can only produce ruin and discontent instead of prosperity and peace.

“In fact, the whole fabric of society has been shaken to its very base and the foundations undermined. The revolution is nearly complete; and by far the worse feature of the present deplorable condition of things is the fact, generally known and acknowledged, that the material comforts and pecuniary condition of the farming class has never been in so good condition

¹ The “*well-known Dublin manufacturer*” must have recently opened his eyes from a Rip Van Winkle-like slumber of two centuries or more in duration! And notwithstanding the claim of plentiful harvests which are exported for the benefit of the landlord, people are dying in Ireland year after year from starvation, through want of land to cultivate for their support!

as it now is (1882). Harvests for the past two years have been plentiful, and the cry of distress has not even been whispered. But there remains yet another and most important wave of revolution in the immediate future, which promises to disturb the present 'settlement.' The laborers, of equal numbers with the farmers, are already on the move. They are complaining that they have been left out in the cold, while the farmers (landlords) have been making themselves snug, and we find the usual steps in revolution proceeding. The revolutionists who have been successful find themselves face to face with two discontented classes. On the one hand are the former owners of property, now mere annuitants, holding by precarious title; and on the other hand are the vast army of laborers demanding from the farmers a share in the spoil. We already see the effect upon the farmers in the verdicts they are now returning against rioters and plunderers. How long the laborers and farmers will remain at peace is an interesting problem. Certain it is they contain between them the seeds of yet another revolution.

"Such is the state of affairs at home. Looking across the Atlantic to what is sometimes called Greater Ireland, we see a vast population of Irish divided into sections among themselves, but united as one body in their desire to inflict injury on England. . . . The smallest concession that would content the Irish in America and the revolutionists at home is such liberties as would belong to a State of the American Union. They see that under such liberties they would soon enact the right of carrying arms, and 'only give us our arms and we shall recover, not only our lands, but our independence.' The immediate consequences would be a civil war, in which England and Scotland would be pitted against Ireland. Ulster would remain, as of old, the vanguard of the two countries, and after a desolating war, there is little doubt who would remain the conquerors. There would be verified the great moralist's commentary upon the folly of human wishes:

" ' How nations sink, by darling schemes oppress,
When vengeance listens to the fool's request ! ' "

Mr. Bagenal attributes the condition he thus describes as existing in Ireland to the efforts of the Irish leaders, but in doing so he has confused the *post hoc* and *propter hoc*.

The subsequent effort to gain Home Rule failed, as we have shown, through the obstructive policy of the House of Lords, which it has always exhibited whenever any measure has been advanced for the benefit of Ireland ; while the same body, we must reiterate, has never failed in promptly giving its approval to every coercion act passed by the House of Commons.

After some years of increasing dissatisfaction in Ireland the British Government was at length forced to make some effort to conciliate the people and what was termed the "Local Government Bill" finally passed both houses of Parliament. Its purpose and effect have already been referred to.

The United Irish League became possible in consequence of the success of the Local Government Bill, as the management of local affairs was gained to some extent by the Nationalists of Ireland through their control of the county councils. The United Irish League was advanced on the experience gained from the Land League Movement. It was started by Mr. William O'Brien and its full organization was brought about to a great extent through his efforts, with the hearty co-operation of Mr. Michael Davitt and Mr. John Dillon. It has become firmly established and its existence has effected again a close union among the Irish people. On the same lines as the old Land League, its chief purpose is to get rid of the landlords of Ireland as a class and to recover the land, that the mass of the people may be saved from the constant fear of famine. As much of this land would thus again become possessed by the descendants of those who were dispossessed, chiefly in the seventeenth century, the fact of the change of holding will prove a potent means towards insuring peace and content throughout the country. The importance of success attending this movement has not been fully appreciated. Sentiment has done much to keep alive the recollection of the great injustice inflicted on the Irish people by these land confiscations but, with the conviction once established that

some restitution had been made, the past would soon be forgotten through the conservative spirit which always influences the holders of landed property. The five-acre fee-simple holding of the poor man would be as effective as the domain of the rich man in creating this conservatism. This sentiment of possession would be more conducive to the preservation of law and order in Ireland than all the troops England could command.

CHAPTER X

THE AIM OF THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE

EARLY in December, 1899, Mr. John Dillon, M.P., delivered a speech in County Cavan on the United Irish League in which (according to a newspaper report) he stated :

" I have always held that we have either to pay for the land of Ireland or to fight for it and instead of being like the Boers, six thousand miles away from England, we are too near it to fight . . . we were denounced in the early days of the Land League as a few obscure individuals in Connaught, who were preaching doctrines of confiscation and communism. There is an old saying about Satan reproving sin and if ever there was an example of Satan reproving sin it was an Irish landlord condemning confiscation. If every Irish landlord was to lose the title to his land when it rested on confiscation, I would like to know how many of them would have a sod? "

At a later meeting held at Rossmore, County Tipperary, on December 3, 1899 (as reported in the *Irish World*, etc., New York, December 23d), Mr. Dillon thus explained in his address the purpose of the United Irish League under the call—" *Landlordism must be swept away.*"¹

" This great meeting has been called for the purpose of planting in this parish, and in the parishes around it, the organization which you have heard alluded to in the resolution which you have

¹ This speech is given almost in full, as Mr. Dillon, from his familiarity with the subject, has presented it in a condensed form.

just passed, the organization of the United Irish League. There is nothing that the Irish people require to-day more than to be united, and now, after one hundred years have rolled over us since that great organization, the United Irish Society, carried the banner of Irish liberty nearer to success than it was ever carried before or since, may it be, and I trust it will be the mission of this organization, which you are assembled here to-day to support and to spread, to unite the people of Ireland, and send a message of hope to the scattered children of the Gael, who will be at your back the very moment you are united.

“If you are united, I affirm with confidence that there is no power to-day under the sun that can stand successfully in your path. The United Irish League has had many critics, as all great organizations, all great movements, have in their infancy, but while it has had many critics, it has no rivals, for I know of no other organization to-day in this country which offers to the people a platform on which they can stand and advocate shoulder to shoulder their right to live in the land of their fathers. I ask those who find fault with the United Irish League what do they propose to put in its place, and I think that they ought to be moderate and cautious in their criticisms until they are prepared to come before the persecuted people of this country and offer them some other policy and some other platform from which they can defeat their enemies.

“It is stated that the United Irish League is a purely Connaught movement. Well, many good things have come from the province of Connaught, and it always seemed to me to be one of the most striking cases of poetic justice in all history that the Land League should have come out of Connaught, to which province, as an alternative to hell, the remnants of the old Celtic race, which had survived a hundred years of famine, fire and the sword, were invited to betake themselves two hundred and fifty years ago by Oliver Cromwell. But is it only a Connaught movement? The idea at first, no doubt, took most vigorous root in Connaught, because there the evil is most crying and the suffering most acute. But the idea is fruitful and is genuinely national in its application, that *the land of a country was intended by Providence for the use of the people of the country, and that it is flying in the face of the law of God and of nature that the people should be*

driven from the land in order that it might feed more bullocks for the markets of a stranger, and produce more rent for alien land-owners.

“And while in Connaught the question of the repopulation of the grass ranches takes a prominent place inevitably, and as a consequence of the circumstances of that province, here in Tipperary and throughout the whole of Ireland, the question of the ownership of their farms and of the reduction of the rents they have to pay, is a question of vital importance, and it is a national question in the widest possible sense. Many years ago it was said that those who own the land of the country own the country, and the root and source of all the miseries and oppressions of the Irish nation has been the confiscation of the soil of Ireland, and the reduction of the nation to a serfdom in the land of their fathers. Talk of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal! We have heard recently much of their grievances, and now a monstrous war has been declared to remedy those grievances.

“But the Irish race have been for three hundred years Uitlanders in their own country, suffering from grievances incomparably greater than any which the Uitlanders in the Transvaal have ever had to complain of.

“And now, after twenty years’ experience of public life, I am as much convinced now as I was when I first joined the Land League in 1879, that when you strike at landlordism in Ireland you strike at the tap-root of that poison tree—the rule of the stranger—which has cursed and blighted national life for three centuries. But we live in strange times. Lately we have been told that there is no land question now in Ireland. According to some authorities, the whole question was settled finally by the great Land Act of 1896, and yet I cannot see in what respect the great bulk of the Irish farmers have been bettered by that act.

“Again, another set of political physicians who undertook to settle Ireland’s troubles through the agency of a round table and a recess committee, evolve the most interesting doctrine that the true cause of the agrarian troubles in Ireland was not landlordism, or excessive rents, but ignorance and incapacity on the part of the farmers. That if the farmers are properly instructed the produce of Ireland could be more than doubled, and the rents would be found to be of little consequence. That is a very dangerous

doctrine to preach at a time when rents are being fixed, and when I saw it preached by some of the chief organizers of the Recess Committee and of the Agricultural Organization Society I felt that the department charged with the fixing of rents and the agents of the landlords would not be long in availing themselves of these statements. And I had not long to wait for proof of the accuracy of my forecast, for before the Fry Commission, witness after witness was asked by the counsel for the landlords whether it was not true that, owing to the co-operative societies, the prices of manure and the general cost of production had been reduced; and I have not the smallest doubt upon my mind that at the present moment many, if not all, the Commissioners settling rents are influenced in their judgment by these considerations.

“In spite of all those who declare that the land question has been settled in Ireland, *I hold that the land question is not settled, and that it lies at the root of and is inextricably bound up with the national question, because so long as the people of this country are at the mercy of landlordism the entire influence of the landlord class will be used as it always has been used since the confiscations, to beat down and paralyze any National movement and to support and bolster up the Castle and all its rotten machinery of government.*

“Are you satisfied with the present proceeding of the land courts? Is there a farmer in Ireland who has confidence in the Land Commission as now manned? Is it not like every other department of Government in Ireland, packed in the interest of the minority and of the landlords? And what hope, what chance is there for the Irish tenant farmers to get justice from such a tribunal?

“*The only effective remedy for this condition of things is to abolish landlordism, root and branch, with all its machinery, agents, landlords, attorneys, writs, processes, eviction-made-easy, notices, and ejectments, and to establish firmly every farmer as the owner of his farm, and every laborer in a decent house, and an acre of land, at a reasonable rent, and in a position of independence.*

“That was the original programme of the Land League, which, in 1878 and 1880, was denounced as confiscation and communism, and since then has been accepted in principle by successive Governments. But when this great settlement comes to be made it will be essential, in my judgment, that the price at which the land

of Ireland is to be transferred must be fixed by some really impartial tribunal, and not by such a packed and one-sided body as the present Land Commission.

"We have a warning on this point in the proceedings connected with the fortieth section of the Land Act of 1896, which, had it been decently administered, would have been a most valuable act in itself. But it has been turned into a machinery for raising the price of land and robbing the liberties of the people. So far as I can make out, Judge Ross and the Land Commission between them are compelling the tenants in many cases to buy their holdings for their full market value as they stand, and so to pay for all their improvements. Be that as it may, it is clear that the only chance for the people of obtaining their farms at a reasonable price will be the existence of a really powerful organization to protect their interests and counteract the constant, steady and well-organized pressure exercised by the landlords' combination in all the machinery of Government in this country.

"No settlement of the Irish land question will be satisfactory or bring peace and contentment to this country which leaves out the just claims of the Irish laborers. And I would say to the laborers that they should make their voices heard, put their programme clearly forward, take care that their demands should be distinct, reasonable and practical, and I venture to suggest to them that the sure plan of obtaining their rights is by throwing themselves heartily into the general national movement, as they did into the Land League when, for the first time in the modern history of Ireland, some real steps were taken to improve the miserable condition of the Irish laborers; and by insisting that a fair and ample measure of reform for the laborers of Ireland should form an integral part of the National programme.

"The United League may have originated in Connaught, but it is no longer confined to that province. In this great county there are, I believe, at the present moment, upward of twenty working branches of the League, and the organization is spreading rapidly in Ulster and in Leinster, and, in my judgment, it will spread more widely still, because its programme is one which recommends it to earnest Nationalists in every part of Ireland.

"The foremost plank in that programme is the assertion of the

national right of Ireland to govern herself, and to abolish forever the government of the stranger in this island, and as a means to that end, and indeed as an inseparable part of that principle, to restore the land of the country to the people of Ireland, to abolish and utterly sweep away the accursed institution of alien landlordism, which, since it was first planted on us by the confiscation of the seventeenth century, has poisoned the well-springs of our national life and assailed our people with every form of calamity and suffering.

“There is another reason why, in my opinion, the United Irish League will spread more and more widely as time goes on. Wherever the League has taken root it has exercised a marvelously healing and uniting influence on the Nationalists of the district. I could give you by dozens the names of districts where for nine years Nationalists had been divided into hostile camps full of bitterness and ready at any moment to fly at each other's throats, to the infinite and inexpressible joy of the *London Times*, the land-grabbers, bailiffs, and all the gang who suck the life-blood of Ireland when she is divided and helpless. And in these very districts a branch of the United League is established, and in a short time the contentions and animosities of the past nine years have disappeared. Nationalists of all shades of opinion as regards past controversies find themselves working harmoniously together again and in perfect accord as to the future, and in perfect agreement that the least said about the immediate past the better. The proof of the pudding is the eating, and it is this last characteristic of the League and its work which will, I believe, ensure its rapid spread throughout the Irish race, more even than any point in its programme. It is the effect which it has had wherever it has appeared in exorcising the demon of dissension and drawing Nationalists together, and the marvellous resurrection of the national spirit and national enthusiasm which has immediately resulted from its beneficent work—it is these ascertained results of the work of the League which will be accepted by the Irish race as the marks and signs of a genuine National movement, and will insure for it a great future.

“And the Union which has been sought by the United Irish League, and which has been effected by it in so many districts, is a real and not a sham union: it is a union not depending on artificial arrangements between individuals, which might break

down at any moment when the temperament of some individuals goes wrong, but a union growing naturally from the passionate resolve of a united and self-respecting people, with foundations deeply laid in an organized nation, and which will last so long as those foundations are unshaken. In this movement, as I understand, it is not sought to proscribe any one. Every Irishman is welcome to help, but no man's help is sought for who will not accept the fundamental principles upon which this movement is based—first, an assertion of the national right of Ireland to self-government; and, secondly, the restoration to the people of Ireland of the ownership of the land of Ireland which was robbed from their fathers. And I most heartily endorse what was said by Mr. James O'Kelly in the powerful and eloquent speech delivered at Kildysart last Sunday, when he spoke as follows:

“ ‘ To achieve this work we need unity among the people ; not a vague, ideal unity of men of all sorts of opinions, but a union of earnest Nationalists who believe in the right of Ireland to be governed by a native Parliament, and in the right of the people to re-take possession of the lands from which their fathers were driven by the confiscation and clearances effected by the English invaders. ’

“ The United Irish League does not believe in the permanency and the efficacy of such combinations. It asks no one to join it except those who faithfully accept its principles and who will agree that within the League there is to be no reference to the differences which have divided Nationalists in recent years. And because the platform is broad and comprehensive and truly national; because it is open to every Nationalist to join it without recanting anything, without humiliation, without negotiation or recrimination; because it has not been started by any section, nor in the interests of any section or individual, but by the people themselves; because it belongs to the people, is controlled by them, and from its very nature cannot be captured by any individual or by any section; because it has proved in innumerable instances that it has the power to restore harmony and union to the National forces in districts where those forces had for years been shattered and paralyzed by dissension—for all these reasons I believe the League will continue to spread and to attract into its ranks sincere and earnest Nationalists wherever the Irish race is scattered.”

The League Must Eventually Succeed 153

Many persons, without giving the subject due thought, have condemned the principles advocated by the United Irish League, as unjust to the landlords, while a larger number are of the opinion that they would be benefited if the movement were carried into operation. From the experience of the past it is shown that the landlords could have obtained a higher price for their land than they could now, had they become the leaders instead of opposing the old Land League movement of twenty years ago, which was advanced essentially on the same line as the one now in operation.

With the present successful revival of the organization under another name but with the same purpose, it is equally to the interest of the landlord, even with a decrease of at least one-half in the value of the land, to offer no opposition to the inevitable. A successful issue must be the ultimate result in response to an almost unanimous demand, through the United League, that the grazing land shall be given up for tillage and divided among the people, as the only remedy for the chronic state of starvation and famine existing in the country. If history teaches anything it shows the uncertainty of the future and the frequent advent of the unexpected. Therefore, the landlords of Ireland should never forget that every acre of land in the country has been confiscated at least three times during the past three hundred and fifty years and, what is of more importance to them, they should remember that the titles gained by the last change rest, from the standpoint of justice, upon a very insecure foundation.

The great majority of the Irish people are now in favor of a just compensation to the landlords and are willing to bear their proportion of the taxes for that purpose; but this may not be their attitude in the future. Naturally the English Government will take no action if the landlords as a whole stand opposed. The latter thereby assume a responsibility the gravity of which with regard to their own interests they do not realize. The political condition of the world is at present too uncertain as to future compli-

cations to permit the landlords of Ireland to trust implicitly and indefinitely to the lasting power of England. At any time, by some combination, Ireland may gain the power to effect a fourth confiscation, which will be undoubtedly made if the necessity then exists for the preservation of the Irish race in their own country. In no other country but in Ireland could the Government remain indifferent to the best interests of the people and the welfare of so large a majority be ignored through centuries for the comparatively insignificant interests of a favored few.

It has long been recognized as a truism in political economy that, with fair compensation, the interests of a minority must always be sacrificed, when necessary, for the benefit of the majority. It is always within the scope and power of every Government to condemn the property of an individual for the public benefit. The procedure advocated by the United Irish League is not without precedent as the British Parliament, at the instigation of the Government, within a recent period did so act in settling the Scotch crofters' troubles. No one at the time regarded the division of the land otherwise than as an act of justice to the poor people of these islands who, fortunately for themselves, were Scotch and not Irish.

It has become necessary that there should be no increase in the land area devoted in Ireland to grazing purposes. Had the Government been sincere of purpose to benefit the Irish people as a whole, this evil would have been checked years ago by law rigidly enforced.

The greed of the "land-grabber" has been for years past the only obstacle to a permanent settlement of the land question, by sale and division among the people. So long as the grazer can afford to overbid and pay a higher price than the cultivation of the land would warrant, the landlord will hesitate to accept a price for his land which under other circumstances would be deemed adequate. If the welfare of the whole country were not at stake the interest of the landlord might be left for future speculation but, as the latter is by comparison but a feather weight in the

balance of interests, he will sooner or later be forced to sell for the common good. The longer the delay the greater will be his loss.

As an indication that the Irish cause is not at a standstill, I am able to quote from a work, remarkable in many respects, from the pen of Mr. T. W. Russell, a member of Parliament for South Tyrone. This gentleman as a member from Ulster opposed the efforts of the National party for years, as they were naturally in opposition to the interests of the section he represented. Notwithstanding, he asserts¹:

“Had Mr. Gladstone been twenty years younger, and had Mr. Parnell not fallen from his high state, the history of Ireland would have flowed in a different channel. An Irish Parliament would now be sitting in Dublin.”

It can in truth be said that no individual did more to defeat the Home Rule movement than Mr. Russell through the strength of his convictions, some of which he probably now realizes were founded on false premises. It is believed that Mr. Russell is still in favor of the Union with England but he has entirely changed his views in reference to the “Land Question” and is now one of the strongest supporters of the principles advocated by the United Irish League.

Under the circumstances it is most appropriate that a consideration of the “Land Question” and the present condition of Irish affairs should be closed with a citation of his views.

In reference to the appointment of Mr. Arthur J. Balfour Chief Irish Secretary, Mr. Russell states:

“The right honourable gentleman was of course a total stranger to the country: but this apparently is the one thing needful in an Irish Chief Secretary: it is, indeed, a *sine quâ non*. To know

¹ *Ireland and the Empire, a Review, 1800-1900*, by T. W. Russell, M.P. for South Tyrone, London, 1901, pp. 111-135. If it were possible for a most charitable man, honest in all his sympathies and efforts for the welfare of every class and section of Ireland, to condemn much and at the same time offer a vindication for the course of the English Government towards Ireland during the past century, Mr. Russell has by this work succeeded in his undertaking.

the country and its needs, to appreciate the people, to have shown an interest in their welfare—all these apparent qualifications act only as serious drawbacks to the office from the English standpoint. . . . When the parliamentary battle over the Crimes Bill had ceased, Mr. Balfour applied himself to the consideration of the Land Question. There were at the moment two great outstanding difficulties. The leaseholders had been excluded from the provisions of the Act of 1881. It was not to be expected that thirty-five thousand tenants of this class would tamely submit to permanent disfranchisement. That a tenant on one side of a ditch who held under a yearly agreement should be able to get his rent revised, a fair rent fixed, whilst a man on the other side should be put out of court simply because he held under a lease, was an arrangement that could not stand. The other difficulty was also serious. The tenants' advocates maintained that the judicial rents fixed between 1881 and 1885 had been fixed on too high a scale and their revision was demanded. There were two points full of embarrassment for a Tory, not to say a Landlord, Government. A large section of the Tory party would have nothing to say to the revision of any contract governed by a lease, and to touch a rent fixed by the Land Court was an offence approaching to sacrilege. The discussions in the Cabinet at this time must have been interesting to a degree. . . . Accordingly a sham Land Bill was introduced; it dodged the leasehold question; it ignored altogether the difficulty connected with the judicial rents. The position was interesting, not to say critical. . . . The Bill was critically examined and a committee of seven appointed to consider and draft amendments. The committee consisted of Lord Hartington, Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Henry James, Lord Lymington, Sir R. Finlay and myself! These amendments were in due time conveyed to the government. The leasehold clauses of the Bill were simply wiped out; reality was made to take the place of sham. The whole leaseholders, whose term did not extend over ninety-nine years, were enfranchised and allowed to enter the Land Court. The judicial rents proved a more difficult matter. The Tory leaders had sworn by all that was sacred they would never give way at this point. It is only needful to say here that they did give way. A provision was inserted in the Bill under which a

temporary and an automatic revision of these rents took place by poor-law unions.

“ In three or four years the Rent Redemption Act was passed, which enacted that in the case of all leaseholders whose term exceeded ninety-nine years, or who held under perpetuity and fee-farm grants, the tenants should have the right to buy out the lessor’s interest; and in the event of the lessor refusing to sell, the lessee was empowered to enter the Land Court and have a fair rent fixed. This Bill—a Government measure by the way—wholly escaped Lord Salisbury’s notice. He publicly declared in his place in the House of Lords that had he known of it nothing would have induced him to sanction it. . . . It is only necessary to say here in regard to the judicial rents, that when Mr. Morley’s committee sat in 1894 every official witness admitted that the contention of the tenant’s advocates upon the point was correct, that the rents for the first four years had been fixed too high, *i. e.*, that the commissioners had not sufficiently taken into account the permanence of the fall in prices. So ended the struggle in 1887.

“ Ere the session of 1888 closed a second grant of £5,000,000 sterling was made to continue the Land Purchase and until 1891 Ireland enjoyed a rare interval of quiet and repose. Mr. Balfour meanwhile visited the West and North-west and saw for himself the miserable conditions under which the great mass of the people lived. These sad conditions have never been quite recognized in Great Britain. The fact that there were tens of thousands of our fellow-subjects shut up in hopeless despair—with no outlet—to whom death and the grave must have been a welcome release, has never quite been taken seriously by the people of England; and yet there stand the stern facts. A great part of the crowded population of the western seaboard live subject to the most shocking conditions. The land is in many places hardly worth cultivating. The riches of the sea are not for these poor people; they have no boats, no capital, and even were the fish caught, the market does not exist, *i. e.*, there are no means of transit thereto. Struggling for a wretched existence and little else, feeding a pig, and rearing a scarecrow of a calf—this is the method by which thousands of human beings drag out a miserable existence. No one outside the area seemed to care.

“ He (Mr. Balfour) pondered over what he had seen; the

condition of the people distressed and haunted him. The great Land Purchase Act of 1891, with its provisions founding the Congested District Board followed. I rank this measure as the greatest of Mr. Balfour's achievements. . . . Convinced that in purchase lay the real settlement of the Land Question, convinced that the experiment made under the Ashbourne Acts was conclusive and warranted the final adoption of the principle, he proposed that Imperial credit to the extent of £33,000,000 should be placed at the disposal of the Irish tenants to enable them to become owners of their holdings. It was a great, a bold, a wise, and statesmanlike proposal. Parliament accepted it. The Act of 1891 is now the sheet anchor of all Land Purchase work in Ireland."

This is undoubtedly true and yet Mr. Russell does not seem aware of the fact that there exists a want of good faith somewhere, that the English officials in Ireland seem to have no heart in this work, due beyond question to their class relationship with the landlord element. So long as the land can be leased to the cattle raiser at a greater profit the object will not be gained. The purchase of an occasional estate to be divided among the tenants is likely to do more harm than good. It has been already stated that to make this measure productive of any extensive benefit to the Irish people, a forced sale is necessary whereby the land in question can be taken by the Government at the same time throughout the country for the public good, at a just valuation based on the agricultural value and not on a fictitious one due to local causes. Another condition exists which an English official can never realize. The history of Ireland does not show a single instance where any measure by which the Irish people proper were to be benefited was ever executed fully and equitably by English officials or their sympathizers. Even in matters of the distribution of charity the Irish have been so unjustly treated, to use no harsher term, that it has become second nature with the mass of the people to put no trust in the fair execution of any Government measure. It is scarcely doubt-

ful that *this necessary distribution of the land will never be properly or fairly carried out until it is done under the supervision of an Irish Parliament.*

Mr. Russell continues to treat this subject as follows:

“It is on the Land Question the real peace of the country depends. If the policy carried out on the land had wholly failed to produce a better feeling, I should despair of Ireland. It has not wholly failed. Had it not been carried out the country would have been ruined. Making every allowance for the shortcomings of legislation, allowing for maladministration by officials, and by the unfortunate interpretation placed upon certain sections of the statutes by the courts, the results are clear and manifest. The United Irish League is a very different organization to the Land League: its methods are not so appalling as those of the Plan of Campaign. . . . The land must pass to the occupiers on honest and fair terms, etc.

“Now three things are perfectly certain to-day. The Land Question cannot rest where it is . . . again, the education controversy must somehow be brought to a close. It is intolerable that because of religious and conscientious convictions the Catholic youth of Ireland should still be denied the priceless privilege of Higher Education. . . . Finally, it is absolutely necessary that some understanding should be arrived at in regard to the financial relations between the two countries. A Royal Commission has reported that these relations are not fair towards the poorer country. It is no answer for the government—for any government—to say that the Commissioners went wrong, that the Commission itself was not quite impartial. It is no good for the predominant partner to plead ‘not guilty.’ The decision of a competent court has been given against England; that decision stands until reversed. . . . But until this is done the decision of the court stands against England and the Irish grievance is established.”

There seems to exist but one logical solution to the Irish Land Question.

In preparing this Work the writer several years ago gave the same expression of his views, as the reader has already seen, and it is with infinite satisfaction that he now quotes

the conclusion reached by Mr. Russell. On page 203 of his work we find:

“Along the entire western seaboard the state of affairs is revolting in the extreme. The people are planted upon patches that are incapable of yielding anything resembling subsistence for human beings. They are in possession of the worst land—whilst land, prime in quality and plentiful in quantity, lies all around.

“These grazing tracts must be compulsorily acquired. They must be cut up and made into workable holdings. The people must be brought back to the land from which their fathers were driven. And no time should be wasted in setting about the work. The enterprise is a great one, but in its successful achievement lie the fortunes of those long-suffering and much enduring peasants who people these sad but beautiful wastes.”

Since Mr. Russell's book was published there has certainly been an improvement in the condition of some parts of Ireland. The Commission, after years of seeming indifference to active discharge of their duty, have at length entered upon their work and the only obstacle to a satisfactory result is the lack of legal power to acquire for the public good the land required.

At a public meeting held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, on October 26, 1902, Michael Davitt, M.P., made the following statement, which is the latest information the writer has obtained as to the work of this Commission. Mr. Davitt said:

“Seventy thousand farmers now own the land they till, and two hundred and forty thousand tenants have obtained fifteen year leases. A Commission and not the landlord now establishes the rate of rent, and sixteen thousand unsanitary houses have been torn down and replaced by inhabitable dwellings, etc.”

Mr. Davitt did not state—what would have been consistent with the truth—that but for the active work of the United Irish League, which resuscitated by its growing influence this semi-moribund Commission, not an individual in Ireland would have benefited.

CHAPTER XI

ENGLAND AND IRELAND—WHAT IS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY UNION OF THE IRISH PEOPLE

ROBERT EMMET is always cited as the exponent of "physical force." Until within a few years an appeal made to physical force was the only resource open to Irishmen and a desperate and disastrous one it has proved. Under the existing circumstances, it is believed that if Robert Emmet and Thomas Addis Emmet were alive to-day they would advocate a resort to constitutional measures as the only rational course at the present time for the redress of Ireland's wrongs so long as she is obliged to rely on her own efforts.

It is doubtless the innate wish of every true Irish heart that some time the "Old Country" may be a free and independent nation. But it is now no longer a question of sentiment but one of expediency with both the Irish people and the British Government. The present generation can by no means bind future ones and can only deal with the present. The fact cannot be put aside that a separation from England, however desirable, now and under present circumstances, with a reduced population and lack of all resources, would prove a terrible if not fatal ordeal for Ireland unless protected as an ally by some stronger Power.

The tendency of the age is to a federation of nations for mutual protection and thus to lighten the burden of maintaining a standing army, a navy and the other heavy expenditures which must be incurred. The system which has

been developed in the United States of leaving to each State the management of its own domestic affairs is, as a whole and notwithstanding many defects, more conducive to the welfare and happiness of the greater number of people than any other under which all classes have the right of franchise. With such a form of government and with repeal of the present fraudulent "Union" with England, Ireland would in a few years teem with prosperity and a contented people; while her prosperity would tend to the advantage of the British Empire as well.

The existence of any bond of union between the two countries must depend upon either brute force or mutual interest. Political agitation for Home Rule under one form or another will be carried on by some portion of the Irish people until that object is obtained—be its consummation delayed to the next year or for centuries to come. In proof of this be it remembered that for at least three hundred and fifty years past the greater portion of the Irish people have shown in their persistent resistance to English rule a pertinacity of purpose which has not been exerted in like manner by any other race. The resistance has been passive or active according to circumstances but the determination and settled purpose have never wavered and will continue as an opposing force to the end. Therefore, England must eventually recognize that if any real union shall exist it must be one of mutual interest and it is inevitable that sooner or later she must grant full Home Rule to the whole of Ireland. There will then be an Irish Parliament in Dublin in which all classes will be represented with equal rights and power to protect their own industries and to manage their domestic affairs as free from all English influence as the authority of the individual States in the United States is protected under the Constitution from Federal interference.

The people of Ireland will never be contented until all have a voice in the appointment of their magistrates, judges and other local officers; until the jury system has been re-

formed¹; until the relations between tenant and landlord have been equitably and definitely settled by sale and division of the land; and until the people be allowed to fix the rate and mode of collecting taxes and to direct the development of the different resources of the country for the general good. All of these changes must be effected by the Irish people themselves, as England's efforts for the welfare of the country have through centuries past signally failed. This failure may be attributed to the fact that England has never been willing to place the Irish people under the same laws which protected the English, Scotch and Welsh. Had she governed even by special legislation, with a spirit of fairness, Ireland would be to-day one of the most prosperous countries in the world and probably the most loyal portion of Great Britain.

The Irish people who have been driven into exile and are now scattered over the earth have turned the tide of public opinion. At present the universal feeling is opposed to England's misgovernment of Ireland.

In 1833 Battersby wrote the following²:

"There is the thought worthy to be entertained by every honest man. For what purpose do we talk of civilization, liberty, agriculture, manufacture and commerce, if we forget the main body of the people, for whose benefit and happiness they were all designed? To what purpose do we distract our minds about this Government or about that, if bettering the condition of humanity be not our measure, end and aim?

"Men of Ireland, men of England, men of civilized Europe, has the Union worked well for the main body of the Irish people? Has it this day, amidst all the knowledge and civilization of the age, left them better than they were thirty years ago? Has it given them as comfortable eating, drinking, clothing and lodging as they then had? If it has, in God's name continue it. If

¹ The power to effect some of these reforms will be gained by the Irish people when they obtain control in the County Councils, as the effect of the "Irish Local Government Bill" is established.

² Pp. 226, 238, 246, 247.

it has not, will you allow the all-devouring evil to continue until the people have to eat themselves, before they die in 'a land flowing with milk and honey'?

"It was not enough (for the misrulers of Ireland) that in 1823, the vitals of the Irish poor should be preyed on by an enormous establishment: It was not enough that their pot and coat and blankets should be taken from them to pay tithes, without remuneration; it was not enough that their sweat and blood should be extracted to remit exorbitant rents to unfeeling absentees, or rapacious landlords; it was not enough that they should be the victims of undue taxation and unparalleled debt; it was not enough that their best beef, pork, mutton and lamb, should be exported without remitting profit or principal to their country, whilst they had scarcely a meal of potatoes; it was not enough that five millions of their acres were already waste¹ which, if only cultivated, would support themselves and their children with food; it was not enough that their agriculture should be diminished, their manufactures destroyed and their commerce annihilated; it was not enough that they should suffer wrong, insult and oppression from the grand juries, cruel factions and corrupt monopolists; no, they should be taxed still more by a church rate and vesting bill; they should be driven from their homes by the Subletting

¹ It seems incredible that the English Crown holds title to five millions of acres in Ireland, fully one-fourth of Irish territory, as waste lands, which were obtained by seizure as confiscated property and must have been held fully two centuries. If it be true that no effort has been made to improve so extended a landed property the evident and only purpose must have been to injure the people, since for a greater portion of the time they have suffered from famine through the want of sufficient quantity of arable land from which they could derive a reliable support.

There existed no other reason why the English Government should not have received a regular income from this holding, having as good a title as any other Irish land-holder possesses. But if the purpose was to deprive the Irish people of what would have afforded so much relief, surely the spirit was the same as shown in Æsop's fable of *The Dog in the Manger*. The writer has not been able to obtain any accurate information on this point and has only met with an occasional reference to the fact. Postlethwayt, in his work (*Britain's Commercial Interests*, Dublin, vol. ii., p. 204), offers as one of the advantages in favor of the "Union," that: "*As England does already possess no inconsiderable share of the lands of Ireland*, so that the Union would prove an effectual method to vest the rest in her," etc.

The "Union" Incompatible with Progress 165

Act, be hushed to silence by the Algerine Act, be left to perish on the public roads by the Disfranchising Act, and if living after these to be slaughtered in cold blood by legalised yeomanry (Orangemen)! Will any Irishman having a spark of patriotism in his breast, an Englishman having a feeling of humanity, any Christian possessing charity, tell us that it is by such means the Union works well in Ireland?

"Either the main body of English people can be bettered by the ruin of the Irish people or they cannot. If they can, then the God of truth and justice cannot be pleased with the Union, which causes that ruin. But if they cannot be bettered by our ruin, then not only truth and justice, but even the interests of Englishmen demand the repeal. Ireland, enfeebled and misgoverned cannot secure happiness or prosperity to her own people and must remain an incumbrance to the people of England. If her agriculture, manufacture and commerce are daily made worse and worse by the effects of the accursed Union, her advantage to England is daily more and more diminished. Would not England be benefited by a real federal Union with prosperous Ireland, more than with her present Union of want and misery? Shall sensible, shall honest men tell us that this Union which has wrought such evils, which is working such evils, which if allowed to continue much longer, will work our destruction, cannot be repealed without shedding human blood?

"Why not repeal that legally which was carried most illegally? Why not repeal that constitutionally which was effected by force, treachery, bribery and fraud? Why not restore to Ireland her right, without adding murder to robbery? Why not do justice at least now, if you never did it before?

"Either the Union is useful to Ireland, or it is not? If it be really useful to Ireland, advantageous to her people, and calculated to supply their wants, to restore to her land its natural guardians; if it can ameliorate the condition of her poor, feed the thousands that are starving, or dying of famine and sickness, restore to Ireland her manufacture, agriculture and commerce. . . . Are not thirty years sufficient to try it? Have we not seen it under every shape, figure and form? Have we not seen it in war and in peace, under Whig and Tory and every kind of government and after all has it worked well for Ireland?

“If it be not useful to Ireland nor capable of giving peace or happiness to her population; if it be calculated only to sow the seeds of division, of hatred, of want, of misery and of starvation; is it the will of God, is it the will of any man pretending to common justice or humanity, to say it cannot, it should not be repealed until it seals the doom of Ireland?”

Mr. Daunt, in a letter to John Bright, M.P., points out the effects of the “Union” with the necessity for its repeal¹:

“This monstrous state of things had its origin in the ingenious device of forcing upon Ireland at the Union a rate of contribution beyond her ability to meet. She, of course, broke down beneath the unjust load,—a load which was admitted to be an overcharge by a host of statesmen and the parliamentary committee of 1815.

“Yet mark! that avowed overcharge has been argued on and treated as if it had created a just and equitable liability on the part of Ireland and as if its removal by the Consolidation Act of 1816—the removal, mind you, of a load which admittedly ought never to have been imposed—entitled Great Britain, by way of set-off, to deprive Ireland of the periodical revision of her quota, promised by the Act of the Union; to withhold from her the enjoyment of her own special surplus revenue, also promised by that Act; and to bring her under a system of indiscriminate taxation with Great Britain whereby she is made to contribute to the pre-union British debt, charged, as well as all other British burdens, without any regard to her relative capacity.

“The wealth which God has bestowed on Ireland for the support of her inhabitants is annually carried off by England, and the island by whose labour it was produced and among whom, if the island were self-governed, it would circulate in a thousand productive channels, is forced to fly to the ends of the earth in search of subsistence.

“Within the last few years our population has decreased by two millions and a half, while our taxation has increased fifty-two per cent. In return for this wholesale expulsion of our people and abstraction of our money, what value are we given?

¹ *Why is Ireland Discontented? A Letter to John Bright, Esq., M.P., by J. O’N. Daunt, 1869, pp. 11–16.*

“ ‘You are governed,’ it is said, ‘as a part of England. You are raised to the rank of an integral portion of the greatest empire in the world,’ etc. Such is the rhetorical rubbish we are given as compensation for the heaviest wrongs that can be inflicted on a suffering country. I think it probable that between exported taxes, exported rents and the various other pecuniary exportations we have suffered, £300,000,000 sterling are a low estimate of the actual cash drained from Ireland by the operation of the Union. We have lost not only the cash, but the profit which would have accrued on its expenditure in the land that produced it. Much of it would doubtless have been invested in manufacturing enterprise, thus largely diminishing the pressure on the soil and thereby mitigating the evils of insecure tenure. What employment, what support, what an ample stimulant and recompense to Irish industry would not that expenditure have given at home to the millions of our people who are now compelled to quit the plundered land in quest of a livelihood elsewhere ! And yet it is in the face of this gigantic drain that we are told that Ireland was over-peopled and that the exodus results from a natural necessity. The necessity is artificial, not natural. If there be a necessity for the flight of the Irish population it only exists because their country is robbed of the means that should employ and support them at home. Can you wonder that in their inmost hearts they should execrate the system by which they are driven into exile? Can you wonder that the expelled people should lend a ready ear to Fenian delusions? They know that under a native Parliament, faulty as that Parliament was, matters were different.

“It is easy for your countrymen, whose experience of the Union is all the other way, whom the spoils of Ireland have helped to enrich, whose national egotism leads them to suppose that the absorption of our national distinctness into a political incorporation with themselves must confer upon us profit and honour,—it is easy for your countrymen to discard our complaints as frivolous and to deem our grievances unreal. The best way, perhaps, in which they can arrive at more accurate notions is to make our case their own. None of them I believe would consent that any country on earth, except England, should be the arbiter of England’s destiny. Let them fancy themselves

annexed as a sort of appendage to France, just as Ireland is at present, by the Union, appended to England. Such a consummation, according to Lord Macaulay, was at one time probable.¹

“ ‘Had the Plantagenets,’ he says, ‘as at one time seemed likely, succeeded in uniting all France under their government, it is probable that England would never have had an independent existence. Her princes, her lords, her prelates, would have been men differing in race and language from the artizans and tillers of the earth. The revenues of her great proprietors would have been spent in festivities on the banks of the Seine. The noble language of Milton and Burke would have remained a rustic dialect, without literature, a fixed grammar, or a fixed orthography and would have been contemptuously abandoned to the use of boors. No man of English extraction would have risen to eminence except by becoming in speech and habits a Frenchman!’ ”

“So said Lord Macaulay in his *History of England*, and his lordship might have added that the internecine strife which lasted in England for several generations between conquering Norman and vanquished Saxon would have been carefully kept alive as a means of subjugation by the ‘United’ Government at Paris. England would have been grievously taxed for French uses and financiers would have pleaded the ‘imperial’ identity of the two countries in justification of the plunder; while some French Mr. Roebuck would have scoffed in vitriolic language at the impudence of Englishmen calling anything a grievance that happened to suit the convenience of France—at the same time assuring the world that French power was indispensably needed to keep the rival races in England from murdering each other. You would have tasted all the blessings of the Union in theory and practice, just as we taste them now. You might have been permitted in due time to send a few representatives to the French legislature to look on at Frenchmen making laws for England and imposing and appropriating English taxes. How would Englishmen have relished such a condition? Would any theory of imperial fusion have reconciled them to it? Yet, *mutatis mutandis*, that is pretty much like the condition which, to the

¹ *The History of England*, etc., by Lord Macaulay, London, 1865, vol. i., pp. 14-15.

astonishment of some of your countrymen, Irishmen do not accept as a perfect political paradise.

“It is well worth the notice of your countrymen, that among the arguments by which the Union was opposed in the Irish House of Commons, was its tendency to alienate the people of Ireland from England and thereby to imperil the connexion of the two countries. The Fenian conspirators, as far as their rancorous resentment against the British Government is concerned, feel just as the people of England would probably have felt against the Franco-English Government which Macaulay tells us might possibly have ruled them from Paris. Wherever the Irish are dispersed over the earth they hate the Legislative Union. It is hard to believe that true policy demands the preservation of a measure that disgusts and alienates almost a whole race of the Queen's subjects. To borrow words recently used by an illustrious Englishman upon another subject, but which struck me as singularly applicable to the present question: ‘Union is not unity. Heterogeneous and repugnant things may be arbitrarily tied together, but this is not unity. Union has its non-assimilating power. Closer contact elicits the repugnances which rend all external bonds asunder.’

“Fenianism, with its republican and communistic theories derived from American inspiration, is nationality run mad. But the principle of true nationality is to a people exactly what the principle of self-preservation is to an individual. It is the vital principle which tells us that the means which Providence bestows upon a country should be primarily elevated to the well-being of its own inhabitants and that no other country is rightfully entitled to carry them off, under the pretext of imperialism or any other pretext. It is the principle which affirms that each country should be governed primarily for the good of its own people and not for the good of the people of any other country. Now the imperial theory ignores all this; it ignores the distinct autonomy with which the Creator had invested Ireland.

“To govern Ireland as if it were part of England is a fatal experiment, precisely because Ireland is *not* a part of England and never can be made so. The attempt is a source of perpetual misery to the weaker country and of constant irritation and possibly contingent danger, to the stronger.”

Elsewhere Mr. Daunt writes as follows¹:

“Let it not be said that in seeking the repeal of the Union we are seeking the dismemberment of the empire. On the direct contrary, union itself is the real dismemberment. It disjoins the affections of the two countries. It makes their relative positions those of the robber and his victim. Let no man tell me that such a union is essential to the security of Her Majesty’s throne. No true friend of the throne would assert that its security is in any degree dependent on a measure that outrages Irish feeling and that plunders Ireland to such an enormous extent as to cause her rapid depopulation. Such were not the views of Grattan or Foster, who both conceived that the destruction of the Irish Parliament would weaken the zeal of the people in resisting invasion. In truth, if we were to suppose among our Sovereign’s councillors some traitorous statesman, professedly anxious for the stability of the British empire, but secretly plotting its overthrow, could such a statesman more effectually labour for his evil object than by placing or retaining Ireland in a condition which holds her out to the world as so crushed, so despoiled, so misgoverned, as to keep the vast majority of her inhabitants in a state of chronic discontent and to render foreign conquest, in the estimation of many persons, a mere question between one tyranny and another?”

“Now the Union does all this. It is denial to Ireland of the rights which Providence appears to have bestowed upon her. The late Robert Holmes,² in a thoughtful and able pamphlet has the following words: ‘The powers of independent existence

¹ *Ireland since the Union*, by W. J. O’N. Daunt, 1866, p. 20.

² Mr. Holmes married the sister of Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet and was as able a writer on the political affairs of Ireland as his wife. The writer has never seen the article from which the above quotation was taken but he has in his possession several other political tracts from the pen of Mr. Holmes, in one of which the same idea appears:

“On the face of Ireland, Nature with a bold hand has traced the outlines of independence, and had Ireland remained morally as she is physically insulated, Ireland would, no doubt, at this day, be what the warmest fancy could paint, or the fondest heart desire. But from the moment the first English adventurer landed in Ireland the apparent destiny of nature was reversed, and war and carnage, and civil strife, and religious dissension, and brutal manners, and brutal vices, barbarisms and beggary and dependence became the inevitable lot of Ireland.”

seemed to be marked in her (Ireland's) structure in such bold characters that it required the unceasing efforts of an active and malignant policy to defeat the obvious purpose of creation.' Mr. Holmes was right. The Creator has bestowed upon Ireland in her physical structure, in her geographical position, in her natural facilities of supporting a hardy and industrious population, in her fertile soil, in her harbours, which lie open to the commerce of the world—in all these things the Almighty has bestowed upon Ireland the unmistakable features of national individuality. And where He has done this, it is clear that a system which ignores and suppresses that national distinctness is at variance with His bounteous designs and must produce perpetual misery and discontent in the nation that the system afflicts.

"They (the English) can oppress, they can despoil, they can destroy our Parliament, but they cannot by their evil statutes or their evil deeds repeal the great fact of the Almighty, whereby He has made Ireland a distinct community bearing all the indelible marks of separate Nationhood; nor can they eradicate from our hearts the heaven-implemented craving for legislative independence."

There exists a fear that if justice be too long delayed the Irish race may be exterminated at home or become scattered over the earth, never to return. Then Ireland would retain but a name with the loss of her people, traditions, literature and language. But Ireland has always possessed remarkable, innate, recuperative power and her population is to-day fully four times the number spared by Cromwell; so in all probability, long before all be lost, the British Government will, even unwillingly and under pressure, take the necessary steps for her restoration. England must thus eventually recognize the inevitable and Erin's "Sun Burst" will yet be resplendent in the sight of the world—possibly be all the brighter for the delay.

Mr. Fox¹ quotes from Mill's *Essay on England and Ireland* as follows:

"It is not consistent with self-respect, in a nation any more than an individual, to wait till it is compelled by uncontrollable

¹ P. 186. The writer has not seen the *Essay* by Mill.

circumstances to resign that which it cannot in conscience hold. Before allowing its Government to involve it in another repetition of the attempt to maintain English dominion over Ireland by brute force, the English nation ought to commune with its conscience, solemnly reconsider its position. If England is unable to learn what has to be learnt and unlearn what has to be unlearned, in order to make her rule willingly accepted by the Irish people; or to look at the hypothesis on its other side, if the Irish are incapable of being taught the superiority of English notions about the way in which they ought to be governed and obstinately persist in preferring their own; if this supposition, which way we choose to turn it, is true, are we the power which according to the general fitness of things and the rules of morality, ought to govern Ireland? If so, what are we dreaming of when we give our sympathy to the Poles, the Italians, the Hungarians, the Serbians, the Greeks and I know not how many other oppressed nationalities? On what principle did we act when we renounced the government of the Ionian Islands?

“It is not to fear of consequences, but to a sense of right, that one would wish to appeal on this most momentous question. Yet it is not impertinent to say, that to hold Ireland permanently by the old bad means is simply impossible. Neither Europe nor America would now bear the sight of a Poland across the Irish Channel. Were we to attempt it, and a rebellion so provoked could hold its ground but for a few weeks, there would be an explosion of indignation until the many enemies of British prosperity had time to complicate the situation by a foreign war. Were we ever able to prevent a rebellion, or suppress it the moment it broke out, the holding down by military violence of a people in desperation, constantly struggling to break their fetters, is a spectacle which Russia is still able to give to mankind, because Russia is almost inaccessible to a foreign enemy: but the attempt could not long succeed with a country so vulnerable as England, having territories to defend in every part of the globe, and half her population depending on foreign commerce. Neither do I believe that the mass of the English people, those who are not corrupted by power, would permit the attempt. I shall not believe until I see it proved, that the English and Scotch people are capable of the folly and wickedness of carrying fire and sword

The Irish Question a Menace to England 173

over Ireland in order that their rulers may govern Ireland contrary to the will of the people."

Millions of the Irish people have settled in the United States, in all the British Colonies, among the Latin races and even in England. Notwithstanding that there may seem to exist at times an apathy among these people, in reality it is not so extensive; for the greater portion of the Irish and their descendants never lose their interest in the welfare of the Mother-land.

It is a remarkable circumstance that just in proportion as an Irishman keeps green the memory of his native land, does he make a better citizen in the country of his adoption. And in his descendant a greater love of his native country is always stimulated by keeping alive the Irish interests of his forefathers.

Consequently, the influence exerted by the people of Irish blood is felt everywhere and has become an incalculable power abroad which cannot be ignored by England with safety. It has been exerted in the defeat of the Arbitration Treaty in this country; it will be continually exerted in creating public opinion to England's detriment; and this will surely be maintained until Ireland is granted self-government with the same rights, laws and protective interests that are enjoyed by the English people themselves.

Grattan said: "We will persevere till there is not one link of the English chain left to clank upon the rags of the meanest beggar in Ireland."

This power alone is to be feared by England, for it is only in this opposition to that country that the mass of the Irish people and their descendants abroad can ever be thoroughly united with one common interest, since they differ in religion and politics with as great a diversity of opinion on all subjects as can be found among any other people.

Grattan made a remarkable prophecy in the Irish House of Commons, shortly after the close of the American Revolution. It was addressed to the English Minister:

"Do you see nothing in that America but the grave and prison of your armies? And do you not see in her range of territory, cheapness of living, variety of climate and simplicity of life, the drain of Europe? Whatever is bold and disconsolate . . . to that point will precipitate and what you trample on in Europe will sting you in America."¹

But let the Irish people at home recollect that Moore has sung:

"Erin, thy silent tear shall never cease,
Erin, thy languid smile ne'er shall increase,
Till, like the rainbow's light,
Thy various tints unite
And form in Heaven's sight
One arch of Peace."

Mr. Gladstone's letter to Mr. Dillon, which was read at the London banquet on St. Patrick's Day, 1898, was his last act in the interest of the Irish race. He wrote²:

"Your cause is in your own hands. If Ireland is disunited her cause so long remains hopeless; if, on the contrary, she knows her own mind and is one in spirit, that cause is irresistible."

At no time did Mr. Gladstone express himself in words of deeper meaning for the welfare of Ireland and every Irishman who has sincere love for his country must appreciate their importance.

If the demand for Home Rule and Equal Rights be made by a united people, *England will make atonement for the past, in order to insure her future safety.* If she does not then heed the opportunity presented her and relies upon an apparent want of unity among the Irish people, at some time during complications which may arise at any hour in Europe she will find an enemy at her back where she might have had a friend.

¹ Grattan's *Speeches*, vol. i., pp. 117-118.

² From newspaper report.

It has been fittingly said that Ireland’s opportunity will come with England’s difficulties and that opportunity may be near at hand. But let us lay aside all speculation as to the future and deal with the present. The one essential feature presents itself—that until the Irish people are willing to forego the consideration of all differences in regard to details of policy—that until they unite as one body that the will of the majority may decide for the whole—nothing can be accomplished in a demand for justice nor can they gain their independence, even should the opportunity occur.

Union of the people for the purpose of obtaining, by constitutional measures if possible, the right of self-government for Ireland is of even greater importance at the present day than when Robert Emmet, as a boy, in an appeal for unity and physical force to sustain the efforts of the United Irishmen wrote:

“ ERIN’S CALL

“ Brothers arise! Your country calls—

Let us gain her rights or die;
In her cause who nobly falls,
Decked with brightest wreaths shall lie;
And Freedom’s genius o’er his bier
Shall place the wreath and drop a tear.

“ Long by England’s power opprest,
Groaning long beneath her chain,
England’s ill-used power detest;
Burst her yoke; your rights regain;
The standard raise to liberty—
Ireland! you shall be free.

“ Brothers, march, march on to glory—
In your country’s cause unite;
Freedom’s blessing see before you—
Erin’s sons, for freedom fight;
England’s legions we defy,
We swear to conquer or to die.”

ROBERT EMMET.

CHAPTER XII

ENGLAND'S DIFFICULTIES CREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING IRELAND'S CONDITION—CAN SHE PROFIT BY THEM?

SINCE this Work was brought to a close in 1898, many changes have taken place in the condition of Ireland and in England's relations with that country and abroad. At that period England was apparently the most powerful of all nations, the financial interests of the world centred in London, she was mistress of the seas, having the carrying trade of all other nations, with a navy to protect her mercantile fleet larger than that of any two Powers which might combine against her. Above all, her diplomatic position was so powerful that her wish had to be respected in all the general diplomatic affairs of the world. But with all this power she was no less arrogant than of old nor was she more generous in her dealings with weaker nations; hence the war with the Boers.

At the beginning of the twentieth century the United States of America were already a rival in finance, they had already gained a large portion of the carrying trade of the world, were able to undersell England in her manufacturing interests and to supply a large portion of her food; while Great Britain's influence everywhere was greatly lessened.

England's navy was still in numbers larger than that of any other Power but it became evident that she was without men to man her vessels fully and many of her ships were

inefficient; while France at least surpassed her in the possession of more vessels and of guns better adapted to modern warfare. Although England is still a powerful nation from a monetary standpoint and as yet her credit has been but little impaired, nevertheless she has lost prestige.

Under these circumstances Ireland's opportunity is nearer and England's failing condition will result eventually in Ireland's gain, even while England, learning nothing by experience, resorts to coercion again and again as her only remedy, thus uniting the people in pressing for Home Rule.

The *Westminster Gazette* is an English paper which, so far as the writer can judge, has been moderate in politics but in the past rather more indifferent than favorable to the course of the Irish people. The following editorial is taken from an issue of that journal printed December 31, 1900, and is presented as an indication that at least some thought is being given by the English Press to the present status of Ireland. The article is termed “ The Basis of Consent ”:

“ The controversy about the first year of the twentieth century seems even now to be hardly a *chose jugée*, but to-day is beyond question the last day of the first hundred years of the ‘ United ’ Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The Act of the Union came into force on January 1st, 1801. For a whole century we have tried our hand at the government of Ireland; he would be a bold man who would affirm that *the result had not been a dreary failure*. The end of the century finds us face to face with the prospect of our ‘ Imperial ’ Parliament being occupied with an Irish demand concurred in by no fewer than 95 out of the 103 Irish Members. That demand has reference to the land question, but an even more significant fact is that four out of every five Irish Members are Nationalists and Home Rulers, a proportion which has been steadily maintained at every one of the five elections that have taken place since the franchise was placed on a really popular basis by Mr. Gladstone in 1884. During the last few years Englishmen have rather hugged the delusion that the Irish question was completely done with. Ireland has been

quiet, there has been a happy freedom from crime, agrarian or otherwise, the Irish members have seemed more anxious to break each other's head (we speak metaphorically) than to combine against the accursed Saxon. Furthermore, Ireland has at last been given the same local government that England, Wales and Scotland have for many years past practised and enjoyed. Out of sight is out of mind, and there have been many to think that the Nationalist spirit in Ireland was really being extinguished.

"We need hardly say that we welcome any signs of a better attitude towards Ireland, and it is a great step forward that a Tory Government should have at last been compelled to redeem its pledge (extracted in the course of the Home Rule controversy) and allow Irishmen to govern themselves in Town and County Councils. It is too early as yet to say what the result will be, but this much can be said—that thus far there is nothing to justify the sinister and gloomy predictions with which in some quarters the change was received by those who did not dare actually to seek to prevent it. We have it now admitted in the clearest possible way—by a deliberate and formal entry upon the Statute-book—that the Irishman is not constitutionally incapable of managing his own local affairs, any more than his fellow Englishman, Scotchman or Welshman. It is no mean thing that the doctrine of 'original sin' should have disappeared, and the fact of its disappearance is a clear rebuke to those who imagine that Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule movement achieved nothing because the two Home Rule Bills were neither of them carried. But let any one who thinks that Home Rule has been killed by kindness read the remarkable manifesto recently issued by Mr. William O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien has made some serious mistakes in the past, and has rather come to be regarded as a factor that need not be reckoned with; but it would be ostrich-like not to recognise that he has achieved a wonderful performance in getting the Irish party apparently united (with one important exception) and that in compulsory sale he has a cause which commends itself to nearly all Irishmen, even those who are least attracted by Home Rule. A hundred years, in fact, finds the Irish people profoundly dissatisfied with English rule, nor can we be surprised that this should be so. Look back over the history of the century and what do we find? A constant succession of instances

in which we have persistently declined to accede to Irish demands until what should have been conceded as of course has only been grudgingly granted under circumstances depriving us of all credit for the gift. We use the word gift advisedly, because Ireland has always been governed by authority imposed from without. The so-called 'loyalists' may have been Irishmen but they have been the English garrison, and the ascendancy temper has always been resented by those against whom it has been persistently directed. Mr. Gladstone's Land Acts and the grant of the Local Government have done something to get rid of this temper, but it still exists—as Mr. Horace Plunket can testify to his cost.

"Alone of the Britains—'not the least important,' as Lord Rosebery called her in 1897 when lamenting that she held aloof from the 'joyous festivities' of the Jubilee—Ireland has dwindled in population and resources in the fast closing century. Something may be due to economic causes that are independent of forms of government but the fact is undoubted and is calculated to give us pause when we look around upon the Empire at the beginning of a New Century. Mr. John Morley, in a warning in the *Times* 'against resort to any Ionic order of political architecture,'—states the problem which we have failed to solve in Ireland—it is 'how to work a free system resting on a basis of consent, and that consent not forthcoming.' We may make up our mind that until that consent is secured we shall always have an Irish question. And whether the words Home Rule are used or not we may be pretty sure that the consent will not be given until we have satisfied or extinguished the Irish Nationalist sentiment. Since none of the signs point to extinction, the inference is an obvious one."

It is not true that the Irish people gained by the Local Government Bill the freedom enjoyed by the people of England, Wales and Scotland. It was promised that the same measures would be granted but the Government as usual violated its pledge and interpolated so many restrictions that the measure has essentially proved a failure in giving complete management of local affairs. But, through means of the County Councils in which the Irish people have gained the majority, much good has already been indirectly

accomplished, while they are now masters of the situation to the exclusion of those in sympathy with that portion of the landlord class whose interests are English.

In organizing the Land League movement, Mr. Michael Davitt sowed the seed, which has borne good fruit in the development of the United Irish League, and chiefly through the efforts of Mr. William O'Brien. With the Home Rule movement in abeyance for the present, the United League has proved an effective means of uniting again the Irish people; all evidence of former dissension has disappeared. In the settlement of the land question as advocated by the United Irish League, the Presbyterian farmer of the north has now an equal interest and sympathy for the movement as has the starving tenant of the congested districts of the west. Unless something unforeseen occur the delegation of 103 Irish Members in Parliament will be essentially a unit on the Land Question when it comes under consideration—the only exception being the doughty Colonel Sanderson of Ulster, whose Orangeman's prejudices, which he would term principles, are too deeply dyed in the wool to permit him to favor a measure by which the whole of Ireland would be benefited.

In June, 1900, a convention was held in Dublin with Mr. John E. Redmond in the chair. The object of the meeting was to organize the National party, to prepare for the general election and to select or suggest the names of those best fitted to represent the people in Parliament. The meeting was a remarkable success, especially in bringing about unity among the leaders.

By the late general election in Ireland for members of Parliament, the National party delegation was increased in numbers and now, as a whole, constitutes a body of men well fitted for efficient service. Mr. John Redmond was elected chairman for the season, a man of tact and not unlike the late Mr. Parnell in some of his characteristics as a leader.

Finally, on the 11th of December, 1900, "the Parliament

of the Irish People," as it was termed, assembled in Dublin; a meeting which will be notable in the history of Ireland as the most completely representative body ever held. In the judgment of a large majority of the delegates it was decided necessary for the safety of the National movement to put aside all those who among the leaders were unwilling to conform to the wishes of the majority and, as a radical measure, it was effective in producing harmony throughout the party.

As a result, the Irish people at home and abroad were never so united for any political object and with well-selected leaders, who hold the balance of power between the two great political parties in the British Parliament, success must attend their efforts in the future.

An editorial in the *Boston Pilot* of March 30, 1901, thus briefly states the political situation in Ireland:

"The truth is that the Irish people have 'through ages of bondage and slaughter,' sought three great ideals. The first was for the right to worship God according to their own rites and beliefs. A few links of a broken chain still remain, but at least things have improved from the time when a priest was hanged for saying Mass and a peasant transported for listening to it. The second Irish idea is the emancipation of the land. In that direction, much has been done, for if the people still groan under oppressive rent, at least the property in the land has gone back to the people; all the work of Elizabeth and Cromwell and William has been undone. The third idea is that of nationhood—there the great battle remains to be fought to the end."

Now that the Boer war is ended, Ireland will be fortunate if she escape punishment by the British Government for her want of sympathy and because the Irish throughout the world have been the only people who have openly denounced England's course. An attempt at retribution will then follow, for Ireland's cause is never so progressive as when England finds it necessary to coerce the people.

In 1883, Mr. John Redmond, on leaving Australia,

concluded a farewell address in the following eloquent words, which are, notwithstanding the long interval, even more applicable to the present outlook in Ireland:

“ I believe in my mind and conscience Ireland’s night is well-nigh over. True, her plains and valleys lie shrouded still in darkness, but the Watcher on the tower sees a break in the far East, a ruddy glow upon the mountain-top, and knows that the God of the day has risen, and that the things of darkness shall disappear. When that moment comes for which our forefathers so wildly prayed and wept and struggled—then will go up to Heaven a cry that will be echoed over the ocean and wafted by the four winds to the corners of the earth, that will be chorussed in America and re-echoed here under the Southern Cross, and the sea-divided Gaels wherever they may be will hear that cry and will know, for their glad hearts will tell them, that the God of Justice has at last rewarded the tears and sufferings of a faithful people and that Ireland—their Ireland—is free! ”

APPENDIX

NOTE I

(From page 7, Vol. I.)

IRELAND A COUNTRY ALMOST WITHOUT CRIME

NOTE I.—The following appeared in one of the New York papers (the *Irish World*, April 15, 1899) from an Irish correspondent:

“ A COUNTRY WITHOUT CRIME

“ The papers that are so fond of representing the Irish as drunken and riotous rowdies have not of course printed the following item of news which this week's exchanges bring from Ireland:

“ ‘ WHITE GLOVES IN LIMERICK

“ ‘ LIMERICK, March 27, 1899.—At the Limerick Quarter Sessions to-day Judge Adams was presented with white gloves by the City High Sheriff, Mr. T. H. Cleeve, and made the customary complimentary references to the crimelessness of the City.

“ ‘ There was no case of crime to be brought before the judge and therefore he was presented with white gloves, as is usual in Ireland on such occasions, that is, occasions of judges of Quarter Sessions or of Assizes, coming to town on their ordinary circuit and finding nothing to do in the way of trying cases of crime. Already this year we have had two or three other reports of the kind to notice. White gloves to the judge is, in fact, a regular feature in the quarterly assize reports from Ireland. Needless to say no such thing is ever heard from England or Scotland.’

"At the close of the same term in the spring of 1899, the judges of Longford, Waterford and Drogheda also received each a pair of white gloves."

The writer has seen the following in an Irish newspaper of later date:

" 'SLIGO, January 26, 1901.—To-day at the opening of the Sligo Quarter Sessions, Judge O'Connor Morris was presented with a pair of white gloves as there were no criminal cases to go before him. This fact does not bear out remarks at the Winter Assizes in reference to the "*criminal*" combinations that have become so *widespread over the different counties in Connaught.*' "

The "criminal" combinations thus designated by the "Castle" judge doubtless had reference to the United Irish League, which organization we will see hereafter had at this date united the Irish people with an increase of the National spirit and at the same time had done more to keep the people of Ireland quiet during a longer period than England ever was able to do with all the troops and constabulary force she could command.

The following appeared as an editorial in the *Irish World*, September 27, 1902:

"FACTS ABOUT COERCION AND CRIME"

"Fifteen of the thirty-two counties and four of the principal cities of Ireland, including Dublin, the capital, are now 'Proclaimed' under the Coercion Act passed in the jubilee year of Queen Victoria. This means that the people of these counties and cities are shut out from the benefit of law, such as it has been in Ireland, and liable at any moment to arbitrary arrest and trial without a jury before 'removable' magistrates, that is, magistrates who hold their offices by appointment from and at the pleasure of Dublin Castle, and may, therefore, be removed whenever, if ever, they cease to do the bidding of their castle employers and paymaster.

"The ostensible purpose of the proclamations subjecting nearly half of Ireland to such law and government as this is to prevent and punish crime, the exact words of the act being: 'For the prevention, detection, and punishment of crime and outrage in Ireland.' It might, therefore, be natural and reasonable to sup-

pose—that is, a person not acquainted with the traditions and spirit and aims of the British law in Ireland might naturally suppose—that the fifteen counties and four cities must be in a very bad condition with regard to crime. Let us see how the situation stands. There is no country in the world in which there is a permanent police force so numerous in proportion to the population as Ireland. The total population is under five millions; while the number of police is about fourteen thousand. By a little calculation it will be found that this means over six thousand police for a population of not much more than two millions, and the police in Ireland are a force armed with bayonets, revolvers and rifles. When we are told, then, that notwithstanding the presence and activity of six thousand armed police, a special coercion act is necessary for the detection and punishment of crime in such a community—a community of two millions, to a great extent scattered over rural districts—what is to be or can be our conclusion, if we are not otherwise better informed, than that it is a community of criminals, or at least the vast majority of the population are criminals?

“This is the only possible conclusion from the facts of the situation as so far stated and from the terms of the proclamations. But there are other facts—the real facts as to crime in Ireland—and they reveal a very different condition of things. What are these facts? We set them down as follows, and we commend them to the attention of all who desire to know the truth about government in Ireland as it exists at the present time, and carried on by Englishmen who are never done boasting of their love of justice and constitutional freedom.

“The first of the two proclamations issued by Dublin Castle during the present year was issued in the month of April, and declared to apply in nine counties, of Cavan, Clare, Cork, Leitrim, Mayo, Roscommon, Sligo, Tipperary, Waterford, and in the two cities of Cork and Waterford. Its professed object was stated to be ‘The prevention, detection and punishment of crime and outrage’ in those counties and cities. Now, in the month of March—the month immediately preceding this proclamation—and again in the month of July following, there were in each of these counties and cities the usual assizes for trial by the high court judges of serious cases of crime, and what was the official

record of criminality—the record presented by the police to the judges and by the judges to the grand juries? Here they are for each county and city, as taken from the actual address of the judge at each assize session:

“CAVAN, March 8th.—Lord Chief Baron: ‘I am happy to be able to inform you (the grand jury) that your duty at the present assizes for Cavan will be almost nominal. There is really only one bill to go before you.’

“July 5th.—Lord Chief Baron: ‘Your business at the present assizes is of the very lightest character. There are only two bills for your consideration.’

“CLARE, March 3d.—Lord Chief Justice O’Brien: ‘The county is free from crime involving loss of life.’

“July 7th.—Lord Chief Justice O’Brien: ‘There is no bill to go before you, and you meet but to part.’

“CORK COUNTY, March 20th.—Judge Johnson: ‘I have no reason for saying that the condition of the county is otherwise than peaceable.’

“July 12th.—Judge Andrews: ‘There is a very considerable diminution of cases in the East Riding. Since last Assizes there has been a reduction of fifty per cent., compared with a corresponding period of last year. With regard to the West Riding the state of things is more satisfactory.’

“CORK CITY, March 24th.—Lord Chief Justice O’Brien: ‘It is my pleasing privilege to tell you that there are very few cases to go before you. Your labors will be light indeed for your city. So far as crime is concerned, it is in a very satisfactory condition.’

“July 24th.—Lord Chief Justice O’Brien: ‘Gentlemen, the cases from the City of Cork require no observation from me; they are cases of no exceptional importance. We should be prepared to meet such cases in a community of any considerable size.’

“LEITRIM, March 3d.—Judge Kenny: ‘There are ten cases for your consideration. They nearly all belong to the category of ordinary crime, such as is found to exist in any large community.’

“July 3d.—Judge Madden: ‘The returns indicate a marked improvement in the condition of the county.’

“MAYO, March 17th.—Judge Andrews: ‘The general condition of the county is satisfactory.’

“July 16th.—Judge Walker: ‘The general condition of the

county appears to be satisfactory. The crime to dispose of is extremely light.'

"ROSCOMMON, March 12th.—Judge Kenny: 'The calendar is light not only in point of number, but of the character of the offences comprised in it.'

"July 14th.—Judge Madden: 'I am happy to be able to say that none of the cases represent crime of a serious or exceptional character.'

"SLIGO, March 7th.—Judge Andrews: 'No case of crime to report, but the state of the country is highly unsatisfactory, as I have been informed "there are in it forty-seven branches of the United Irish League."'

"July 8th.—Judge Andrews: 'The offences are few and trifling in character.'

"TIPPERARY, March 8th.—Judge Madden: 'None of the bills present features of any exceptional character, nor are any of them likely to give you any especial trouble.'

"July 7th.—Judge Johnson: 'This great and historic county which has played so important a part in the annals of Ireland, presents in both Ridings a remarkable absence of crime. At the Assizes in the North Riding, when I presided at Nenagh, there was practically no crime whatever.'

"WATERFORD COUNTY, March 11th.—Judge Barton: 'The criminal business is very light, and there is only one case to go before you.'

"July 9th.—Judge Kenny: 'I am glad to be able to tell you that the calendar is an extremely light one. There are only two cases returned for trial.'

"Such is the official judicial record of the nine counties and two cities proclaimed by Dublin Castle in April as so criminal that they could be kept in order only by coercion. As will be seen, there was not a single murder to report in any of them, nor an attempt at murder, nor even an assault. Much the same is the record of the six counties of Dublin, Galway, Limerick, Longford, Queens, and Westmeath, and the two cities of Dublin and Limerick, 'proclaimed' in the beginning of the month. In these counties and cities the judges reported as follows at the summer Assizes; previous to the proclamation, the summer of the present year:

" DUBLIN COUNTY, August 5th.—Judge Wright: 'The county is in a very satisfactory condition of peace and order, and, on the whole, crimeless.'

" DUBLIN CITY, August 5th.—Judge Wright: 'The cases to come before you are exceedingly light, considering the extent of the city and its population.'

" GALWAY, July 21st.—Judge Madden: 'There is nothing to show that the condition of your county is anything but satisfactory.'

" LIMERICK COUNTY, July 11th.—Judge Andrews: 'There is, upon the returns and information, an indication of some, though not a very large improvement.'

" LIMERICK CITY, July 11th.—Lord Chief Justice O'Brien: 'I am very glad to tell you that your city appears to be in a very peaceable and satisfactory condition. The Grand Jury could not have less to do, because they have nothing to do—there is no bill to go before them.'

" LONGFORD COUNTY, July 5th.—Judge Gibson: 'There is but one case to go before you. The number last year was exactly the same.'

" QUEEN'S COUNTY, July 4th.—Judge Kenny: 'I am very pleased to be able to inform you that your duties on this occasion will detain you a very short time. There are only three bills to go before you. This light calendar seems to be a reflex of the general condition of your county.'

" WESTMEATH, July 3d.—Lord Chief Baron: 'There are only three cases to go before you. None of them were important.'

"There we have the sum total of the criminality of the fifteen Irish counties and four Irish cities which the British Government has deprived of trial by jury and given over to the arbitrary domination of magistrates, most of them chosen from a class known to be deeply imbued with religious and race prejudices against the mass of Irish people and all of them avowedly antagonistic to Irish Nationality in any shape or form. Ireland is thus ruled by Englishmen on the false allegation that it is a country of crime—an allegation to which the lie is plainly given by the reports as above quoted—reports by Dublin Castle appointed judges, who would be only too eager, if they had the slightest ground or excuse, to present reports very different in

character. There is no crime in Ireland among the Irish people, properly so called. The only criminals in the country are its rulers and their landlord and magistrate and police allies and agents. This fact is attested by impartial outside witnesses, such, for example, as the writer of a remarkable cable letter from Dublin, published in the New York *World* of Sunday last, in which the infamy of the Government system in Ireland is thus described:

“ ‘DUBLIN, September 20th.—Ireland now presents a unique spectacle in the matter of government. The official criminal statistics just issued show a large and continued decrease in every kind of crime. Ireland, in fact, is still the most crimeless country in Europe, yet the constitutional right of trial by jury is now suspended throughout the whole country, except Ulster, and sentences of from one to six months' imprisonment are daily inflicted by tribunals specially appointed to punish the Nationalists, who tell the tenants they should no longer pay excessive rents. Several members of Parliament have been imprisoned for the same offence. Many others are in process of being convicted, and the newspaper editors who publish speeches to which exception is taken by the government are also being sent to prison.

“ ‘There is, in fact, no crime in the country except what is manufactured by the magistrates, who virtually hold their offices on condition that they convict all the Nationalists brought before them. Recently two of these magistrates in County Clare, having had to acknowledge that there was no evidence whatever against a batch of Nationalists charged with intimidation, acquitted them; but, determined not to let them off, by resorting to a statute seven hundred years old, they held them to bail for their good behaviour, with the option of going to prison. The Nationalists refused to give bail, and are now in jail. The Government has defended and justified that magisterial proceeding.’

“ ‘In view of all these facts—facts and not mere assertions of ours or of anybody's, facts presented by judges from the bench and in official statistics—in view of these facts, can any honest man say that British rule in Ireland to-day is not an outrage on the fundamental principles of human liberty and a scandal to the civilized world?’ ”

NOTE II

(From page 9, Vol. I.)

CONTROL OF THE IRISH PRESS BY THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT

The Press has always been controlled in Ireland by the Government through terror or by bribery. The following extract, taken from a published letter written in 1809, by Wellington, while Irish Secretary, to Sir Charles Sexton, the Under-Secretary, is one of interest in this connection. He writes: "The measures which I had in contemplation in respect to newspapers in Ireland, *it is quite impossible to leave them entirely to themselves. I am one of those, however, who think that it will be very dangerous to allow the press in Ireland to take care of itself, particularly since it has so long been in leading strings. You shall increase the sum they are allowed to charge on account of advertisements and other publications.* It is absolutely necessary, however, to keep the charge *within the sum of Ten thousand Pounds per annum*, voted by Parliament, which probably may be easily done when some newspapers will cease to publish proclamations and the whole will receive a reduced sum on that account, even though *an increase should be made on account of advertisements* to the account of some. It will also be very necessary *that the account of this money should be of a description always to be produced before Parliament.* Ever Yours, &c.—ARTHUR WELLESLEY."

The Italics are as originally printed.

NOTE III

(From page 61, Vol. I.)

EXTRACT FROM THE IRISH APPEAL TO POPE JOHN XXII.

"Heaven forbid that your Holiness should be thus neglected and it is to protect our unfortunate people from such a calamity that we have resolved here to give you a faithful account of the recent state of our kingdom, if indeed a kingdom we can call the melancholy remains of a nation, that so long groans under the tyranny of the Kings of England, and of their Barons: some of whom, though born among us, continue to practise the same

rapine and cruelties amongst us, which their ancestors did against ours heretofore. We shall speak nothing but the truth and we hope that your Holiness will not delay to inflict condign punishment on the authors and abettors of such inhuman calamities.

“Know then, that our forefathers came from Spain, and our chief Apostle St. Patrick, sent by your predecessor, Pope Celestine in the year of our Lord 435, did by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, most effectually teach us the truth of the Holy Roman Catholic Faith, and that ever since that, our Kings well instructed in the faith, that was preached to them, have, in number Sixty-one, without any mixture of foreign blood, reigned in Ireland to the year 1170. And those kings were not Englishmen, nor of any other nation but our own, who with pious liberality bestowed ample endowments in lands and many immunities on the Irish Church though in modern times our churches are most barbarously plundered by the English, by whom they are almost despoiled. And though those our kings, so long and so strenuously defended, against the tyrants and kings of different regions the inheritance given them by God, preserving their innate liberty at all times inviolate: yet, Adrian IV. your predecessor, an Englishman, more even by affection and prejudice than by birth, blinded by that affection and the false suggestion of Henry the Second, King of England, under whom, and perhaps by whom St. Thomas of Canterbury was murdered, gave the dominion of this our Kingdom by a certain form of words to that same Henry the Second, whom he ought rather to have stript of his own on account of the above crime.

“Ever since these English appeared first upon our coasts, in virtue of the above surreptitious donation, they entered our territories under a certain specious pretext of piety and external hypocritical show of religion; endeavoring in the meantime, by every artifice malice could suggest, to extirpate us root and branch, and without any other right, than that of the strongest, they have so far succeeded by base and fraudulent cunning, that they have forced us to quit our fair and ample habitations and paternal inheritances and to take refuge like wild beasts in the mountains, the woods and the morasses of the country; nor can even the caverns and dens protect us against their insatiable avarice. They pursue us even into these frightful abodes,

endeavoring to dispossess us of the wild uncultivated rocks, and arrogating to themselves the property of every place on which we can stamp the figure of our feet: and through an excess of the most profound ignorance, impudence, arrogance, or blind insanity scarce conceivable, they dare to assert that not a single part of Ireland is ours, but by right entirely their own.

“Hence the implacable animosities and exterminating carnage which are perpetually carried on between us; hence our continual hostilities, our detestable treacheries, our bloody reprisals, our numberless massacres, in which since their invasion to this day more than fifty thousand men have perished on both sides; not to speak of those who died of famine, despair, the rigors of captivity, nightly marauding and a thousand other disorders, which it is impossible to remedy, on account of the anarchy in which we live: anarchy which, alas! is tremendous not only to the state, but also to the Church of Ireland; the ministers of which are daily exposed, not only to the loss of the frail and transitory things of this world, but also to the loss of those solid and substantial blessings which are eternal and immutable.

“Let these few particulars concerning our origin and the deplorable state to which we have been reduced by the above donation of Adrian IV. suffice for the present.

“Besides, where they ought to have established virtue they have done exactly the contrary: they have exterminated our native virtues and established the most abominable vices in their stead.

“For the English, who inhabit our island, and call themselves a middle nation (between English and Irish) are so different in their morals from the English of England, and of all other nations that they can with the greatest propriety, be styled a nation not of middling, but of extreme perfidiousness; for it is of old, that they follow the abominable and nefarious custom, which is acquiring more inveteracy every day from habit, namely, when they invite a nobleman of our nation to dine with them, they, either in the midst of the entertainment, or in the unguarded hour of sleep, spill the blood of our unsuspecting countrymen, terminate their detestable feast with murder, and sell the heads of their guests to the enemy. Just as Peter Brumicheame, who is since called the treacherous baron, did with Mauritius de S——, his

fellow sponsor, and the said Mauritius's brother, Calnacus, men much esteemed for their talents and their honor among us: he invited them to an entertainment on a feast day of the Holy Trinity; on that day the instant they stood up from the table, he cruelly massacred them, with twenty-four of their followers,¹ and sold their heads at a dear price to their enemies; and when he was arraigned before the King of England, the present King's father, no justice could be obtained against such a nefarious and treacherous offender. . . .

"All hope of peace between us is therefore completely destroyed: for such is their pride, such their excessive lust of dominion, and such our ardent ambition to shake off this unsupportable yoke, and recover the inheritance, which they have so unjustly usurped: that, *as there was, so there never will be any sincere coalition between them and us; nor is it possible there should in this life, for we entertain a certain natural enmity against each other, flowing from mutual malignity descending by inheritance from father to son, and spreading from generation to generation.*

"Let no person wonder then, if we endeavor to preserve our lives, and defend our liberties, as well as we can, against those cruel tyrants, usurpers of our just properties and murderers of our persons; so far from thinking it unlawful, we hold it to be a meritorious act, nor can we be accused of perjury or rebellion, since neither our fathers nor we, did at any time bind ourselves by any oath of allegiance to their fathers or to them, and therefore without the least remorse of conscience, while breath remains, we will attack them in defence of our just rights, and never lay down our arms until we force them to desist.

"Therefore, on account of all those injuries and a thousand others, which human wit cannot easily comprehend, and on account of the Kings of England, and their wicked ministers, who instead of governing us, as they are bound to do, with justice and moderation, have wickedly endeavored to exterminate us off the face of the earth, and to shake off entirely their detestable yoke, and recover our native liberties, which we lost by their means, we are forced to carry on an exterminating war: choosing in defence of our lives and liberties, rather to rise like men and expose our persons bravely to all the dangers of war, than any

¹ Other instances of like treachery have been already cited.

longer to bear like women their atrocious and detestable injuries: and in order to obtain our interests the more speedily and consistently, we invite the gallant Edward Bruce, to whom, being descended from our noble ancestors, we transfer as we justly may, our own right of royal dominion, unanimously declaring him our King by common consent, who in our opinion, and in the opinion of most men, is as just, prudent and pious, as he is powerful and courageous: who will do justice to all classes of people, and restore to the church those properties, of which it has been so damnably and inhumanly despoiled. . . .”

In response to this letter from the Irish Chiefs the Sovereign Pontiff addressed a letter to Edward III. of England, from which the following is taken showing that the complaints of the Irish people were well grounded.

After referring to the action of Pope Adrian, the Holy Father writes¹: “To the object of these letters neither Henry nor his successors have paid regard, but passing the bounds that were prescribed to them, have, without cause or provocation heaped upon the Irish the most unheard of miseries and persecution, and have, during a long period, imposed upon them a yoke of slavery which can not be borne. None have dared to stem the persecutions which have been practised against the Irish, nor has any person been found willing to remedy the cause of them: not one, I say, has been moved, through a holy compassion for their sufferings, although frequent appeals have been made to your goodness in their behalf, and the strong cries of the oppressed have reached the ears of your majesty. Thus no longer able to endure such tyranny, the unhappy Irish have been constrained to withdraw themselves from your dominion and to seek another to rule over them in your stead. . . .

“In order, therefore, that your majesty may become acquainted with the grievances of the Irish people, we send to you, enclosed, the letters they have sent to the above-named cardinals, with a copy of the bull which our predecessor Adrian, of happy memory, hath sent to the illustrious Henry, King of England, concerning the act of conferring on him the Kingdom of Ireland. Given &c., &c.”

¹ MacGeoghegan's *History of Ireland*, etc., pp. 333-334.

NOTE IV

(From page 78, Vol. I.)

THE REMONSTRANCE OF THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND DELIVERED
TO HIS MAJESTY'S COMMISSIONERS, AT TRYM, 17TH OF
MARCH, 1642

“TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“MOST GRATIOUS SOVEREIGNE,

“Wee your majestie's most dutifull and loyall subjects, the Catholiques of your highness' Kingdome of Ireland, being necessitated to take armes for the preservation of our religion, the maintenance of your majestie's rights and prerogatives, the natural and just defence of our lives and estates, and the liberties of our country, have often since the beginning of these troubles, attempted to present our humble complaynts unto your royal view, but we are frustrated of our hopes therein by the power and vigilance of our adversaryes (the now lords justices and other ministers of state in this Kingdome), who by the assistance of the malignant partie in England, now in armes against your royal person, with less difficultie to obtain the bad ends they proposed to themselves, of extirpating our religion and nation, have hitherto debarred us of any access to your majestie's justice, which occasioned the effusion of so much innocent blood and other mischiefs in this your Kingdom; and that otherwise might well bee prevented. And whereas of late notice was sent unto us of a commission granted by your majestie to the Right Honourable the Lord Marques of Ormond and others, authorizing them to heare what we shall say or propound, and the same to transmit to your majestie in writing, which your majestie's gracious and princely favour, wee finde to be accompanied with these words, *Viz.: albeit wee doe extreemly detest the odious rebellion, which the recusants of Ireland have, without ground or colour, raised against us, our crown and dignitie*; which words wee doe in all humilitie conceive to have proceeded from the misrepresentations of our adversaryes and therefore do protest, wee have been therein maliciously traduced to your majestie, having never entertained any rebellious thought against your majesty, your crowne or dignitie, but always have been and ever shall continue, your

majestie's most faithfull and loyall subjects, and doe most humbly beseech your majestie soe to owne and avowe us, and as such wee present unto your majestie these ensueing grievances and causes of the present distempers.

“*Imprimis.* The Catholiques of this Kingdome, whom no reward could invite, no persecution could enforce, to forsake that religion professed by them and their ancestors for thirteen hundred years or thereabouts, are since the second year of the reigne of Queen Elizabeth, made incapable of places of honour or trust, in church or commonwealth, their nobles become contemptible, their gentry debarred from learning in Universities,¹ or public schools within the Kingdom, their younger brothers put by all manner of employment in their native country, and necessitated (to their great discomfort and impoverishment of their land) to seek education and fortune abroad, misfortune made incident to the said Catholiques of Ireland only (their numbers, qualitie and loyaltie considered) of all the nations of Christendome.

“2ndly. That by this incapacitie, which in respect to their religion was imposed upon the said Catholiques, men of mean condition and qualitie, for the most part, were, in this Kingdome, employed in places of the greatest honour and trust, who being to begin a fortune, build it on the ruins of the Catholique natives, at all times lying open to be discountenanced and wrought upon, and who (because they would seeme to be carefull of the government), did from tyme to tyme suggest false and malicious matters against them, to render them suspected and odious in England; from which ungrounded information, and their many other ill offices, these mischiefs have befallen the Catholiques of Ireland. First, the opposition given to all the graces and favours, that your Majestie or your late royall father promised or intended to the natives of this Kingdom; secondly, the procuring false inquiries, upon feigned titles of their estates, against many hundred years possession and no travers or petition of right admitted

¹ It is a remarkable fact that at the end of 258 years Ireland has still to complain of the same injustice, viz., that the English Government, in consequence of the bigotry of a few individuals, will not yet sanction a Catholic university in Ireland, notwithstanding it has already endowed one for the Church of England and two for the dissenters, while the Protestants are greatly in the minority.

thereunto, and jurors denying to find such offices were censured even to publique infamie and ruin of their estates, the finding thereof being against their consciences and their evidences, and nothing must stand against such offices taken of great and considerable parts of the Kingdome but letters pattent under the great seale; and if letters patent were produced (as in most cases they were) none must be allowed valid, nor yet sought to be legally avoided, soe that of late times by the underhand working of Sir William Parsons, Knight, now one of the lords justices here, and the arbitrary illegal power of the two impeached judges in parliament and others drawn by their advice and counsell, one hundred and fifty letters pattents were avoyded one morning, which course continued untill all the patents of the Kingdome, to a few, were by them and their associates declared void: such was the care those ministers had of your majestie's great seale, being the publique faith of the Kingdome. This way of service in shew only pretended for your majestie, proved to your disservice and to the immoderate and too timely advancement of the said ministers of state and their adherents, and nearly to the utter ruin of the said Catholiques.

“3rdly. That whereas your majestie's late royall father, King James, having a princely and fatherly care of this Kingdome, was graciously pleased to graunt severall large and beneficiall commissioners, under the great seale of England, and several instructions and letters under his privie signett, for passing and securing the estates of his subjects here by letters pattents under the great seale and letters pattents accordingly were thereof passed, fynes payed, old rentes encreased and new rents reserved to the crowne; and the said late King was further gratically pleased, att several tymes, to send divers honourable persons of integritie, knowledge and experience, to examine the grievances of this Kingdome, and to settle and establish a course for redress thereof; and whereas your Majestie was gratically pleased, in the fourth yeare of youre reigne, to vouchsafe a favourable heareing to the grievances presented unto you, by agents from this Kingdome and thereupon did grant many graces and favours unto your subjects thereof, for securities of their estates and redress for removal of those heavy pressures, under which they have long groaned; which acts of justice and grace extended to this people

by your Majestie, and your said royal father, did afford them great content, yett, such was, and is yett the immortall hatred of some of the said ministers of state, and especially of Sir William Parsons, the said impeached judges and their adherents to any welfare and happiness of this nation, and their ambition to make themselves still greater and richer, by the total ruine and extirpation of this people, that under pretence of your majestie's service, the public faith involved in those grants were violated, and the grace and goodness intended by two glorious Kings successively, to a faithful people, made unprofitable.

"4thly. The illegal, arbitrary, and unlawfull proceedings of the said Sir William Parsons, and one of the said impeached judges, and their adherents and instruments, in the court of wards, and the many wilfully erroneous decrees and judgments of that court, by which the heirs of Catholique noblemen and other Catholiques were most cruelly and tyranically dealt withall, destroyed in their estates, and bred in dissolution and ignorance, their parents debts unsatisfied, their younger brothers and sisters left wholly unprovided for, the auncient and appearing tenures of mesne lords disregarded, estates valid in law and made for valuable considerations avoyded against law, and the whole land filled up with the frequent swarms of exheators, feodaryes, pursuivants, and others, by authoritie of that court.

"5thly. The said Catholiques, notwithstanding the heavy pressures before mentioned, and other grievances in part represented to your majestie by the late committees of both houses of parliament of this Kingdome (whereunto they humbly desire that relation being had, and redress obtained therein) did readily and without reluctance or repineing contribute to all the subsidies, loanes, and other extreordinary graunts made to your majestie in this Kingdome, since the beginning of your reigne, amounting unto well neare one million of pounds, over and above your majestie's revenue, both certain and casual, and although the said Catholiques were in parliament and otherwise the most forward in graunting the said summes, and did beare nine parts of ten in the paymente thereof, yet such was the power of their adversaries, and the advantage they gained by the opportunity of their continuall address to your majesty, to encrease their reputation by getting in of those monies, and their authoritie in the distribu-

tion thereof to your majestie's great disservice, that they assumed to themselves to be the procurers thereof, and represented the said Catholiques as obstinate and refractory.

"6th. The army raised for your majestie's service here, to the great charge of the kingdome, was disbanded by the pressing importunitie of the malignant partie in England, not giving way, that your majestie should take a desire therein with the parliament here, alledging the said army was Popish and therefore not to be trusted, and although the world could witness the unwarrantable and unexampled invasion made by the malignant partie of the parliament of England, upon your majestie's honour, rights, prerogatives and principal flowers of your crown; and that the said Sir William Parsons, Sir Adam Loftus, knight, your majestie's vice-treasurer of this Kingdome and others their adherents, did declare that an army of ten thousand Scots was to arrive in this Kingdome, to force the said Catholiques to change their religion, and that Ireland could never doe well without a rebellion, to the end the remaine of the natives thereof might be extirpated, and wagers were laid at a general assize and publique meetings by some of them and now employed in places of greates profit and trust in this kingdome, that within one yeare no Catholique should be left in Ireland: and that they saw the ancient and unquestionable privileges of the parliament of Ireland unjustly and against law encroached upon, by the orders, acts and proceedings of both houses of parliament in England in sending for and questioning to and in that parliament, the members of the parliament of this Kingdome, sitting the parliament here: and that by speeches and orders printed by authority of both houses in England, it was declared, that Ireland was bound by the statutes made in England, if named: which is contrary to known truth, and the laws here settled for four hundred years and upwards; and that the Catholiques were thoroughly informed of the protestations of both houses of parliament of England against the Catholiques, and of their intention to introduce lawes for the extirpation of the Catholique religion in the three Kingdomes, and that they had certain notice of the bloody execution of priests there, and only for being priests, and that your majesty's mercy and power could not pervaile with them to save the lyfe of one condemned priest, and that the Catholiques of England being of

their own flesh and blood, must suffer or depart the land, and consequently others not of so neere a relatione to them, if bound by their statutes and within their power. These motives, although very strong and powerfull to produce apprehensions and fears in the said Catholiques, did not prevaile with them to take defensive armes, much less offensive; they still expecting that your majestie in your high wisdom might be able in a short tyme to apply seasonable cures, and apt remedies unto those evils and innovations.

“7th. That the committees of the lords and commons of this kingdome, having attended your majestie for the space of nine months, your majestie was graciously pleased, notwithstanding your then weightie and urgent affaires in England and Scotland, to receive, and very often with very great patience to hear their grievances, and many debates thereof at large; during which debates the said lord justices and some of your privy councill of this kingdome and their adherents, by the malicious and untrue informations conveyed to some of the ministers of state in England (who since are declared of the malignant partie) and by their continuall solicitation of others of the said privy councill, gone to England, of the purpose to cross and give impediment unto the justice and grace your majestie was inclined to afford to your subjects of this realme, did as much as in them lay, hinder the obtaining of any redress for the said grievances, and not prevailing therein by your majestie, as they expected, have by their letters and instruments laboured with many of the leading members of parliament there, to give stopp and interruption thereunto; and likewise transmitted unto your majestie and some of the state of England sundry misconstructions and misrepresentation of the proceedings and actions of your parliament of this kingdome, and thereby endeavoured to possess you with an evil opinion thereof, and that the said parliament had no power of judicature in capitall causes (which is an essentiall part of parliament), thereby ayming at the importunity of some of them and others, who were then impeached of high treason, and at the destruction of this parliament, but the said lords justices and others observing, that no art or practice of theirs could be powerful to withdraw your majestie’s grace and good intentions from his people, and that redress graunted of some particular grievances were to be passed as acts of parliaments, the said lords justices and their adherents, with

the height of malice, envying the good union long before settled and continued between the members of the house of commons and their good correspondence with the lords, left nothing unattempted, which might raise discord and disunion in the said house, and by some of themselves and some instruments of theirs in the Commons House, private meetings of great numbers of the said house were appointed of purpose to raise distinction of nation and religion, by means whereof a faction was made there, which tended much to the disquiet of the house and disturbance of your majestie's and the publikes service, and after certain knowledge, that the said committees were by the waterside in England, with sundry important and beneficial bills, and other graces, to be passed as acts in that parliament, of purpose to prevent the same, the said faction, by the practice of the said lords justices, and some of the said privy councill and their adherents, in a tumultuous and disorderly manner, on the seventh day of August, 1641, and on severall days before, cryed out for an adjournment of the house; and being over voted by the voices of the more moderate partie, the said lords justices and their adherents told severall honourable peers, that if they did not adjourne the Lords House on that day, being Saturday, that they themselves would prorogue or adjourn the parliament on the next Monday following, by means whereof, and of great numbers of proxies of noblemen, not estated, nor at any tyme resident in this kingdome (which is destructive to the libertye and freedom of parliaments here), the Lords House was on the seventh day of August adjourned, and the House of Commons by occasion thereof, and of the faction aforesaid, adjourned soon after; by which means those bills and graces, according to your majestie's intention and the great expectation and longing desires of your people, could not then pass as acts of parliament.

“Within few dayes after this fatal and enforced adjournment, the said committees arrived at Dublin, with their dispatch from your majestie, and presented the same to the lords justices and the councill, expressing a right sense of the said adjournment, and besought their lordships for the satisfaction of the people, to require short heads of that part of the dispatch wherein your majestie did appeare in the best manner unto your people might be suddenly conveyed unto all the partes of the kingdome,

attested by the said lords justices, to prevent despaire or misunderstanding. This was promised to be done, and an instrument drawn, and presented unto them for this purpose, and yet (as it seems desiring rather to add fuell to the fire of the subjects discontents than quench the same) they did forbear to give any notice thereof to the people.

“8th. After this certain dangerous and pernicious petitions, contrived by the advise and counsell of the said Sir William Parsons, Sir Adam Loftus, Sir John Clotworthy, Knights, Arthur Hill, Esq., and sundry other of the malignant partie, and signed by many thousands of the malignant partie in the city of Dublin, in the province of Ulster, and in sundry other of the partes of this kingdome, directed to the Commons House in England, were at publique azzizes and other publique places made known and read to many persons of qualitie in this kingdome; which petitions containned matters destructive to the said Catholiques, their religion, lives, and estates, and were the more to be feared by reason of the active power of the said Sir John Clotworthy in the Commons House in England, in opposition to your majestie, and his barbarous and inhumane expressions in the house against the Catholique religion and the possessors thereof. Soon after an order conceaved in the Commons House in England, that no man should bowe unto the name of Jesus (att the sacred sound all knees should bend), came to the knowledge of the said Catholiques, and that the said malignant partie did contrive and plot, to extinguish their religion and nation. Hence it did arise that some of the said Catholiques began to consider the deplorable and desperate conditione they were in, by a statute law here found amongst the records of this kingdome of the second yeare of the reigne of the late Queen Elizabeth (but never executed in her tyme, nor discovered till most of the members of that parliament were dead) by which no Catholique of this kingdome could enjoy his life, estate or lyberty, if the said statute were executed, whereunto no impediment remayned but your majestie’s prerogative and power; which were endeavoured to be clipped, or taken away, as has been rehearsed; then the plott of destruction by an army out of Scotland, and another of the malignant partie in England must be executed, the feares of those two-fold destructions and their ardent desire to maintaine that just prerogative, which

might encounter and remove it, did necessitate some Catholiques in the north, about the 22nd of October, 1641, to take armes in maintenance of their religion, your majestie's rights, and the preservation of life, estate and libertie; and immediately thereupon took a solemn oath, and sent several declarations to the lords justices and councill to that effect, and humbly desired that they might be heard in parliament, unto the determination whereof they were ready to submit themselves and their demands; and by the advise of the said two impeached judges, glad of any occasion to put off the parliament, which by the former adjournment was to meete soone after, caused a proclamation to be published on the 23d of the said month of October, 1641, therein accusing all the Catholiques of Ireland of disloyaltie, and thereby declaring, that the parliament was prorogued until the 26th of February following.

“9th. Within few dayes after the said 23d October, 1641, many lords and other persons of ranke and qualitie, made their humble address to the said lords justices and councill, and made it evidently appeare to them, that the said prorogation was against law, and humbly besought the parliament might sit according to the former adjournment, which was then the only expedient, to compose or remove the then growing discontents and troubles of the land; and the said lords justices and their partie of the councill, then well knowing, that the members of both houses throughout the kingdome (a few in and about Dublin only excepted) would stay from the meeting of both houses, by reason of the prorogation, did by proclamation two days before the time, give way the parliament might sitt, but so limited, that no act of grace, or anything else for the peoples quiet or satisfaction, might be propounded and passed; and thereupon a few of the lords and commons appeared in the parliament house, who at the entrance of the castle bridge and gate, and within the yarde to the parliament house doore, and recess from thence, were environed with a great number of armed men, with their matches lighted, and muskets presented even at the breasts of the members of both houses, none being permitted to bring one servant to attend him, or any weapon about him within the castle bridge, yet how then soever the houses were, or how much overawed, they both did supplicate the lords justices and councill, that they might

continue for a tyme together, and expect the comeing of the rest of both houses, to the end, that they might quiet the troubles in full parliament, and that some acts of security graunted by your majestie, and transmitted under the great seale of England, might pass, to settle the minds of your majestie's subjects; but to these requests, soe much conducing to your majestie's service, and settlement of your people, a flatt denyall was given; and the said lords justices and partie of the councill, by their working with their partie in both houses of parliament, being very thyn, as aforesaid, propounded an order should be conceived in parliament, that the said discontented gentlemen took armes in a rebellious manner, which was resented much by the best affected of both houses; but being awed as aforesaid and credibly informed, if some particular persons amongst them stood in opposition thereunto that the said musketteers were directed to shoote them att their going out of the parliament house, through which terror, way was given to that order.

“10th. Notwithstanding all the beforementioned provocation, pressures, and indignities, the farr greater and more considerable parte of the Catholiques, and all cittyes and corporations of Ireland, and whole provinces, stood quiet in their houses, whereupon the lords justices and their adherents well knowing, that many powerfull members of parliament in England stood in opposition to your majestie, made their application, and addressed their dispatches full fraught with calumnies and false suggestions against the Catholiques of this Kingdome, and propounded unto them, to send several great forces to conquer this Kingdome, those of the malignant partie here were by them armed: the Catholiques were not only denied arms, but were disarmed, even in the city of Dublin, which in all succession of ages past, continued as loyall to the crowne of England, as any citty or place whatsoever; all other auncient and loyall cittys and corporate towns of the kingdome (by means whereof principally the kingdome was preserved in former tymes) were deneyed armes for their money to defend themselves, and express order given by the said lords justices, to disarm all Catholiques in some of the said cittys and townes, others disfurnished, were inhibited to provide armes for their defence, and the said lords justices and councill having received an order of both houses of parliament in England, to

publish a proclamation of parliament of pardon unto all those, who were then in rebellion (as they tearmed it) in this kingdome, if they did submit by a day limited, the said Sir William Parsons, contrary to this order, soe wrought with his partie of the councill, that a proclamation was published of pardon only in two countyes, and a very short day prefixed, and therein all freeholders were excepted, through which every man saw that the estates of the Catholiques, were first Aymed att, and their lives next. The said lords justices and their partie haveing advanced their design thus far, and not finding the success answerable to their desires, commanded Sir Charles Coote, knight and baronet, deceased, to march to the county of Wicklow, where he burnt, killed, and destroyed all in his way in a most cruell manner, man, woman, and childe; persons, that had not appearingly wills to doe hurt, nor power to execute it. Soone after some foote companies did march in the night by direction of the said lords justices and their said partie, to the towne of Sauntry in Fingal, three miles off Dublin, a country that neither then, nor for the space of four or five hundred years before, did feel what troubles were, or war meant; but it was too sweet and too neare, and therefore fit to be forced to armes. In that town innocent husbandmen, some of them being Catholiques, and some Protestants taken for Catholiques, were murdered in their inn, and their heads carryed tryumphant into Dublin. Next morning, complaynt being made of this, no redress was obtained therein, whereupon some gentlemen of qualitie, and others the inhabitants of the country, seeing what was then acted, and what passed in the said last march towards the county of Wicklow, and justly fearing all to be murthered, forsook their houses, and were constrained to stand together in their own defense, though ill provided with arms and ammunition. Hereuppon a proclamation was agreed uppon at the board, on the 13th of December, 1641, and not published or printed till the 15th of December; by which the said gentlemen and George Kinge, by name, were required to come in, by or upon the 18th of the same month, and safety was therein promised them. On the same day another proclamation was published, summoning the lords dwelling in the English pale near Dublin, to a grand councill on the 17th of the said month; but the lords justices and their partie of the councill, to take

away all hopes of accommodation, gave direction to the said Sir Charles Coote, the said 15th day of the said month of December, to march to Clontarffe, being the house and town of the said George Kinge, and two miles from Dublin, to pillage, burn, kill and destroy all that was there to be found: which direction was readily and particularly observed (in a manifest breach of public faith) by means whereof, the meeting of the said grand councill was diverted, the lords not daring to come within the power of such notorious faith breakers, the consideration whereof, and of other the matters aforesaid, made the nobility and gentry of the English pale, and other parts of the province of Leinster, sensible of the present danger, and put themselves in the best posture they could for their natural defence. Wherefore they employed Lieutenant Collonel Read to present their humble remonstrance to your sacred majestie, and to declare unto you the state of their affayres, and humbly to beseech relief and redress; the said lieutenant collonel, though your majesties servant, and employed in public trust (in which case the law of nations affords safety and protection) was without regard to either, not only stopt from proceeding in his employment, but also tortured on the rack at Dublin.

“11th. The lord president of Munster, by direction of the said lords justices (that province being quiet) with his accomplices, burnt, preyed, and put to death, men, women, and children, without making any difference of qualitie, condition, age, or sex, in several parts of that province: the Catholique nobles and gentlemen there were instructed and threatened, and others of inferior qualitie, trusted and furnished with armes and ammunition. The province of Connaught was used in the like measure, whereupon most of the considerable Catholiques in both the said provinces, were inforced (without armes and ammunition) to look after their safety, and to that end did stand on their defence, still expecting your majestie’s pleasure, and always ready to obey your commands. Now the plot of the said ministers of state and their adherents being even ripe, applications were incessantly by them made to the malignant partie in England, to deprive this people of all hopes of your majesties justice or mercie, and to plant a perpetual enmity between the English and Scottish nations, and your subjects of this kingdome.

“12th. That whereas this your majesties kingdome of Ireland in all succession of ages, since the raigne of King Henry the Second, sometime king of England and Lord of Ireland, had parliaments of their owne, composed of lords and commons, in the same manner and forme, qualified with equal liberties, powers, privileges, and immunities with the parliament of England, and onely depend of the king and crowne of England and Ireland, and for all that time, no prevalent record or authentic precedent can be found, that any statute made in England could or did bind this kingdome before the same were here established by parliament: yet upon untrue suggestions and information given of your subjects of Ireland, an act of parliament, entitled *An Act for the speedie and effectual reducing the Rebels in his Majestie's Kingdome of Ireland to their due obedience to his Majesty and the Crowne of England*; and another act entituled *An Acte for adding unto and explaining the said former act*, was procured to be enacted in the said parliament of England, in the eighteenth yeare of your majestie's reign, by which acts and other proclamations your majesty's subjects unsummoned, unheard, were declared rebels and two millions and a half of acres of arable meadow, and profitable pasture, within this Kingdome sold to undertakers for certaine summes of monie, and the edifices, loghs, woodes and bogges, wastes and other appurtenances, were thereby mentioned to be granted and passed *gratis*, which acts the said Catholiques doe conceive to have been forced upon your majesty, and although void and unjust in themselves to all purposes, yet contain matters of evil consequences and extreme prejudice to your majesty, and totally destructive to this nation. The scope seeming to aime at rebels only, and at the disposition of a certaine quantitie of land, but in effect and substance, all the lands in the Kingdome, by the words of the said acts may be distributed, in whose possession soever they were, without respect to age, condition, or qualitie, and all your majesties tenures, and the greatest part of your majesties standing revenue in this kingdome, taken away: and by the said acts, they were of force, all power of pardoning and of granting those lands, is taken from your majesty. A president, that no age can instance the like. Against this act the Catholiques do protest, as an act against the fundamental lawes of this Kingdome, and as an act destructive to your majesties rights and

prerogatives, by colour whereof, most of the forces sent hither to infest this kingdome by sea and land, disavowed any authoritie from your majestie, but to depend upon the parliament of England.

“13th. All strangers, and such as were not inhabitants of the city of Dublin, being commanded by the said lords justices in and since the said month of November, 1641, to departt the said city, were no sooner departed, than they were, by the directions of the said lords justices, pillaged abroad, and their goods seized uppon and confiscated in Dublin, and they desiring to return under the protection and safetie of the state, before their appearance in action, were denied the same, and divers other persons of rank and quality, by the said lords justices employed in publique service, and others keeping close within their doores, without annoying any man, or siding them with any of the said Catholiques in armes, and others in severall parts of the kingdome living under, and having the protection and safety of the state, were soon pillaged and their howses burnt; themselves, their tenants, and servants killed and destroyed, and that by the open direction of the said lords justices and by the like direction, when any commander in chiefe of the army, promised or give quarter or protection, the same was in all cases violated, and many persons of qualitie, who obtained the same, were ruined before others; others, that came into Dublin voluntarily, and that could not be justly suspected of any crime, if Irishmen or Catholiques, by the like direction were pillaged in Dublin, robbed and pillaged abroad, and brought to their tryall for their lives. The citties of Dublin and Cork, and the ancient corporate townes of Drogheda, Yeoghal, and Kingsale, who voluntary received garrisons in your majestie’s name, and the adjacent cuntryes, who relieved them, were worse used; and now live in worse condition, than the Israelites did in Egypt; so that it will be made appear, that more murders, breaches of publique faith and quarter, more destruction and desolation, more cruelty, not fit to be named, were committed in Ireland, by the direction and advice of the said lords justices and their partie of the said councill, in less than eighteene months, than can be paralleled to have been done by any Christian people.

“14th. The said lords justices and their adherents have against the fundamental laws of the lande, procured the sitting of both

houses of parliament for several sessions (nine parts of ten of the naturall and genuine members thereof being absent, it standing not with their safety to come under their power), and made up a considerable number in the house of commons of clerks, soldiers, serveing men, and others, not legally or not chosen at all or returned, and haveing no manner of estate in the kingdome, in which sitting sundry orders were conceived, and dismisses obtayned of persons before impeached of treason in full parliament, or which passed, or might have passed some acts against law, and to the prejudice of your majestie, and this whole nation. And during these troubles, terms were kept and your majestie's court of cheefe place, and other courts sat at Dublin, to no other end or purpose but by false and illegal judgments, outlawries, and other capital proceedings, to attaint many thousands of your majestie's faithfull subjects of this Kingdome: they being never summoned nor haveing notice of those proceedings, and sheriffs made of obscure and meane persons, by the like practices appointed of purpose: and poor artificers, common soldiers, and menial servants, returned jurors, to pass upon the lives and estates of those who came in upon protection and publique faith.

“Therefore the said Catholiques, in the behalfe of themselves and of the whole Kingdome of Ireland, doe protest and declare against the said proceedings, in the nature of parliaments, and in the other courts aforesaid, and every of them, as being heynous crimes against law, destructive to parliaments and your majestie's prerogative and authoritie, and the rights and just liberties of your most faithfull subjects.

“Forasmuch, dread soveraigne, as the application of apt remedies unto these grievances and heavie pressures, will tend to the settlement and improvement of your majestie's revenue, the prevention of further effusion of blood, the preservation of this kingdome, from desolation, and the content and satisfaction of your said subjects, who, in manifestation of their duty and zeal to your majesty's service, will be most willing and ready to employ ten thousand men under the conduct of well experienced commanders, in defence of your royall rights and prerogatives, they therefore, most humbly beseech your majestie, that you will vouchsafe gracious answers to these their humble and just complainys, and for the establishment of your people in a lasting

peace and securitie, the said Catholiques doe most humbly pray, that your majestie may be further graciously pleased to call a free parliament in this kingdome in such convenient tyme, as your majestie in your high wisdom shall think fitt, and urgencie of the present affairs of the said kingdome doth require, and that the said parliament be held in a different place, summoned bye and continued before some person or persons of honour and fortune, of approved faithe to your majestie, and acceptable to your people here; and to be tymely placed by your majestie in this government, which is most necessary for the advancement of your service and present condition of the kingdome, in which parliament the said Catholiques doe humbly pray, these or other grievances may be redressed, and that in the said parliament a statute made in this kingdome in the tenth yeare of King Henry the Seventh, commonly called Poyning's, and all acts explyayneing, or enlarging the same, be by a particular act suspended during that parliament, as it hath been already done in the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth, upon occasions of far less moment, than now doe offer themselves; and that your majestie, with the advice of the said parliament, will be pleased to a course for the further repealing, or further continuance of the said statutes, as may best conduce to the advancement of your service here, and peace of this your realme, and that no matter whereof complaint is made in this remonstrance may debar Catholiques, or give interruption to their free votes, or sitting in the said parliament; and as in duty bound they will ever pray for your majestie's long and prosperous reigne over them.

"Wee the undernamed being thereunto authorized, doe present and signe this remonstrance in the behalfe of the Catholiques of Ireland, dated this 17th day of March, 1642,

"GORMANSTON, LUCAS DILLON,
"ROBERT TALBOTT, JOHN WALSH.

"According to your majestie's commission to us directed, we have received this remonstrance, subscribed by the Lord Viscount Gormanston, Sir Lucas Dillon, Knight, Sir Robert Talbott, Bart. and John Walsh, Esq. authorized by, and in behalfe of the recusants of Ireland, to present the same unto us, to be transmitted to your sacred majesty, dated the 17th day of March, 1642.

"CLANRICKARD AND ST. ALBANS, ROSCOMMON,
"MOORE, MAU. EUSTACE."

NOTE V

(From page 81, Vol. I.)

Temple had opportunity for personal observation of which he not only did not avail himself but he took the greater portion of his material from a large collection of voluntary depositions filling many folio volumes in Trinity College library, Dublin, which in the judgment of to-day would be pronounced to be literally worthless. He had met with great loss of property in consequence of the war and from this cause his enmity to the Irish people possibly biased his judgment. At the commencement of the war in the United States between the North and South, a similar collection was made with the sanction of the U. S. Government from every source, often from irresponsible persons who were not examined under oath, and much of it was published in the newspapers of the day to keep active the war spirit of the people. The historian who would now attempt to furnish the public with a history of that period, based on such material, would hardly be accepted in either section of our country as a reliable authority. It has been claimed that the second reprint of his book was published in London against Temple's wishes and to that extent credit should be given him. Withal, in the judgment of T. F. Dibben, "His account of the Irish Rebellion is one of the most exact and authentic extant!"

NOTE VI

(From page 101, Vol. I.)

IRISH EMIGRANTS WERE FORCED TO CHANGE THEIR NAMES—FEW
ENGLISH SETTLED IN THIS COUNTRY

As an example of this fact, it is authenticated that the father of Sir William Johnson, the agent of the English Government in charge of the Indians in the central portion of the colony of New York, was an Irishman named MacShane. When emigrating to this country as a boy he had to submit to the Anglicizing of his name from William MacShane to William the son of John or Johnson. The early and continued emigration of the Irish to this country during the seventeenth century has been lost sight of, in consequence of this change to English surnames and from the fact that

no vessel was knowingly allowed to sail from Ireland direct but by law was obliged first to visit an English port before clearance papers could be obtained. Consequently every Irish emigrant crossing in an Irish or English vessel, from either England or Ireland, appeared in the official records as English, for the voyage did not begin according to law until the ship cleared from an English port, and all passengers on arrival in this country were rated as English. We prove the converse by establishing these facts, that a large emigration did reach this country by some route which was not under English control. We know that there was constant intercourse with the continent from the west coast of Ireland which England was never able to check. How otherwise can we explain the presence of undoubted Irish surnames unchanged, as found in the early records of the country? And on the other hand we find to-day Irishmen and their descendants in this country bearing the name of Sutton, Chester, Kinsale, White, Black, Brown, Smith, Carpenter, Cook, Butler, etc., proving thereby that this law was enforced by which they were deprived of their pure Irish names, and that they did not or were not allowed to change their names after coming to this country. The colonial records bear testimony that Irish people were here at an early period and so many hamlets on the frontier were designated by distinctive Irish names that, had we no other proof than these facts, we could not honestly divest ourselves of the conviction that Ireland contributed more in numbers for the development of this country than came from any other single source. English historians and those in this country who have written in English interests have impressed the world at large that we are an English people. Great injustice has been done the Irish people by depriving them of credit so justly due them for their labors in this country. My investigations have impressed me with the belief that, of the seventy-five millions forming our present population, there are a far greater number of individuals who could be certain of an African origin than there are of those who could prove a direct English descent.

This subject is treated of at length in an address by the writer on "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," published in the *Journal of the American-Irish Historical Society*, vol. iii.

NOTE VII

(From page 124, Vol. I.)

THE SO-CALLED "SCOTCH-IRISH"—WHO WERE THEY?

The text of this volume had been written a year or more before the author heard an excellent paper entitled *American History as it is Falsified* and read by Mr. Joseph Smith, of Lowell, Mass., at a meeting of the American-Irish Historical Society, in New York, February 7, 1898, since printed in the *Transactions* of that Society. Mr. Smith has treated of the Scotch-Irish question so fully that no apology is necessary for giving a few extracts from his essay referring to this subject:

"The Rev. Andrew Stewart, Presbyterian Pastor of Donaghadee, from 1645-1671, who was born and raised in Ulster, leaves this record: 'From Scotland came many, and from England not a few; yet all of them naturally the scum of both nations, who for debt, or breaking, or fleeing from justice, or seeking shelter, came hither hoping to be without fear of man's justice in a land where there was nothing, or but little as yet, of the fear of God.' . . . The reverend gentleman gives us a further hint of the people who came thus running from the sheriff and the heavy hand of the law. He says: 'In a few years there flocked such a multitude of people from Scotland that the counties of Down, Antrim, Londonderry, etc., were in a good measure planted, yet most of the people made up a body, and it is strange of different names, nations, dialects, tempers and breeding, all void of Godliness, who seem rather to flee God in this enterprise, than to follow His mercy: albeit at first it must be remembered that they cared little for any other church.' . . . 'People of many nations and dialects coming out of Scotland,' needs an explanation. Mr. Motley in his *History of the Dutch Republic* throws a great light upon this subject. He says in effect that the religious wars of Protestant and Catholic and the persecution growing out of them of the ever-increasing sectaries, drove shoals of artisans from Germany, Holland and France to England: Elizabeth of England had troubles of her own and, while she quarrelled with the Pope and disputed his headship, she was jealously insistent of her own leadership of her State Church and had no use for the pugnacious sectaries from across the Channel. In time, owing

to the English jealousy of the foreigners and rival manufacturers and the Queen's abhorrence of rivals against divinely-selected Kings, Elizabeth shut down on the Refugees and refused them asylum. In those days it was a greater offence to insult the Majesty of earth than Heaven. Scotland, then in the throes of religious squabbles and the game of church-plundering, under the practical guidance of John Knox, gave them a welcome as kindred spirits.

"When other days came, when Mary's head had rolled from the block at Fotheringay, when her wretched son was enthroned, the foreign element found Scotland a poor land to live in. The settlement of Ulster gave them their chance, and they flocked there with Scotchmen and Englishmen to settle down and intermarry and become, as all before them had become at that Irish crucible, Irish.

"If, as is pretended, a certain number of Lowland Scotchmen of the Presbyterian religion *accomplished so much in Ulster and America, why have not the majority of the same people accomplished as much in their own land and elsewhere when all the conditions were in their favor?* And again, if so much was accomplished by an Irish environment and an Irish racial mixture, and so little achieved by the pure Scot under more favorable circumstances, is it not a reasonable deduction that the Irish element was the responsible factor in the achievement? If not, why not? . . . Motley says England and Scotland in that age had the rudest system of agriculture in Europe. The highest system of agriculture as well as the linen and woollen industries came with the skilled exiles from Holland and France, and even as great a plunderer as Wentworth was wise enough to foster them.

"And I might ask, why did n't these marvellous Scots make their own country famous for woollen and linen industries; when they made their own laws and could snap their fingers at English jealousy?"

In Reid's *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* (1867, foot-note, vol. i., page 84), a full account is given of Stewart's manuscript history, which has never been published and is among the Woodrow MSS. in the Advocate's Library, Edinburgh. Reid gives a number of quotations from Stewart's work but omitted the portion of the following sentence which is here given in

Italics: "Yet most of the people made up a body, *and it is strange, of different names, nations, dialects, tempers and breeding*, all void of Godliness, etc." Mr. Smith's attention being called to the discrepancy, he stated that he had taken the quotation from *The Plantation of Ulster*, by the Rev. George Hill, of Belfast, Ireland, and he wrote to Mr. Hill for an explanation. The answer, dated April 17, 1899, I have seen and in it Mr. Hill stated: "I have quoted his precise words in both books to which you refer, etc." Thus showing that Reid and others omitted the most important portion of the sentence, to which Motley has given the explanation. Attention has been given this subject at some length as a large portion of the Orangemen in the north of Ireland proudly claim a descent from these people, as well as many of the Anglo-maniacs of this country who boast of their so-called "Scotch-Irish" ancestors. In this connection it will be well for them to consult in addition Reid's *History*, already referred to (vol. i., p. 195), where it will be shown that in 1637 the Scotch Presbyterians of Ireland were persecuted to such an extent that they were driven back into Scotland: "The Western parts of Scotland became at this period, a reasonable asylum for the oppressed people of Ulster. Numbers removed thither compelled to abandon Ireland, where fines and other punishments begin to be inflicted without mercy on the non-conforming laity, etc." From what source, then, came the so-called "Scotch-Irish"?

NOTE VIII

(From page 127, Vol. I.)

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THOMAS A. EMMET TO IRISH HISTORY

Towards the close of Mr. Emmet's confinement as a State prisoner in Fort George, Scotland, for having been a leader in the uprising of 1798, he was granted by the Governor of the Fortress better quarters and the free use of pen, ink and paper. He fortunately availed himself of this privilege by writing an extended sketch in relation to the early organization of the United Irishmen and their efforts to obtain an amelioration of the condition of the Catholic population of Ireland by the repeal of the "Popery Laws," with a description of what led to the outburst of the people in the so-called Rebellion of 1798. The fact that he had taken an active part and was able to relate in detail

the circumstances of which he had a personal knowledge renders his statement of particular value. It may be claimed, moreover, that very few historical events have been so accurately recorded and without prejudice as this portion of Irish history by him. Consequently we will use this material in preference to that which other writers have obtained second hand; it, moreover, possesses the advantage of being rather new material as few writers seem to have had any knowledge of its existence. It is to be regretted that Mr. Emmet was unable to accomplish what he had contemplated in making use of this work in writing an exhaustive historical work. But after his release he was forced to lay aside all thought of undertaking any additional literary labor, in consequence of the demands upon his time in providing for the support of his family.

After Mr. Emmet had settled in New York and had been subjected through party spirit to both insult and opposition, owing to his place of birth and his political connection with it, it became necessary for local political reasons to print Mr. Emmet's essay together with some other material from the same source.

This was done by a United Irishman, a friend and fellow-prisoner of Mr. Emmet, Dr. William James McNeven. He made some additions to the work of Mr. Emmet and published it under the title, *Pieces of Irish History, Illustrative of the Condition of the Catholics of Ireland, of the Origin and Progress of the Political System of the United Irishmen and of their Transactions with the Anglo-Irish Government*, New York, 1807.

But for Dr. McNeven's assistance as an editor it is not likely that the little work would have been published but, at the same time, the fact that it appeared under the name of another, to a great extent deprived Mr. Emmet of the credit to which he was entitled.

NOTE IX

(From page 139, Vol. I.)

ENGLISH SCHOOLS FIRST ESTABLISHED IN IRELAND FOR PROSELYTIZING CATHOLIC CHILDREN—THESE BECAME A PUBLIC SCANDAL AND WERE SUPPRESSED—THE PRESENT NATIONAL SCHOOL SYSTEM

During the early portion of the eighteenth century the Charter Schools were established through the influence of the Bishop of

Clogher, "to rescue the souls of thousands of poor children from the dangers of Popish superstition and idolatry and their bodies from the miseries of idleness and beggary." These schools were freely aided by the Government and the purpose met with generous support from English Protestants generally. A prominent feature of the system was to remove the children to some other portion of the country in order permanently to break up all intercourse with their parents. But in the process of "*rescuing their souls*," these children were starved, maltreated, kept in rags and covered with vermin, while the funds of the Society were for years misappropriated. At an early date the Catholic portion of the people, at least, realized the true condition of things and it was only during the existence of some famine or while in great want that through necessity they parted with their children; and this notwithstanding that the desire of obtaining an education, in Ireland, was at that time greater than existed in any other country. With considerable but unintentional humor, this complaint was made: "Such is the bigotry of these deluded people that nothing but absolute want could prevail on them to suffer their children to receive an education, which as they conceive endangers their salvation!"

John Howard, the philanthropist, in his report on "The State of Prisons, etc.," states that the children were "sickly, naked and half starved" and that the condition of these schools "was so deplorable as to disgrace Protestantism."

After the existence of these institutions in different parts of Ireland for nearly a century public investigation at last revealed so horrible a condition that they were suppressed.

Since 1834 an honest effort, whatever the motive, has been made by the British Government to give every needy child in Ireland the benefit of an "unsectarian education." It is out of place to discuss the mooted question as to how far an education received without fitting religious training can fully benefit the individual or the State. But, outside of those in sympathy with the interests of the English Government, the people of Ireland hold that the present system was established in order to destroy the national aspirations of the people through the disuse and loss of the Irish language, which was not allowed to be used: nor were the Irish children taught the history of their own country.

Russia has pursued the same course in Poland and it is not a wise procedure but an ill-judged one, even from the Government standpoint, for it renders the burden of the yoke more galling. It is this course which has convinced the greater portion of the Irish race that only a total separation from England can preserve the attributes of the Irish people as a nation, if the education of the children is to continue "unsectarian," without a knowledge of the Irish language and in ignorance of the history of the country.

NOTE X

(From page 171, Vol. I.)

JURY-PACKING IN IRELAND ACKNOWLEDGED BY GOVERNMENT
OFFICIALS TO EXIST AND ITS FUTURE USE IN IRELAND
ENDORSED BY PARLIAMENT

According to the official report of the proceedings in Parliament on Friday, May 3, 1901, as published in the daily Press a portion of the debate was as follows:

"Mr. T. O'Connor (Irish Nationalist, and member for the Scotland Road Division of Liverpool) opened a fierce debate on the Irish Question yesterday, by moving to reduce the salary of the Attorney-General for Ireland, asserting that not only was jury packing one of the most flagrant evils of legal administration in Ireland, but that the whole system was calculated to produce abrogation of law and to suppress individual and national liberty.

"Sir Edward James Reed (Liberal) said the Attorney-General for Ireland had admitted the practice of jury packing on a large scale.

"Many members took part in the debate, among them Mr. T. W. Russell (Ulster), who said he had been packed on a jury, a remark which provoked Mr. Patrick O'Brien to exclaim: 'I was packed in jail for saying you were packed.' Mr. Russell: 'No one need tell me that Jurors are not packed in Ireland, for I have gone through the operation myself.'

"Mr. O'Connor's motion was rejected by a vote of 173 to 105."

As on previous occasions whenever this subject has been brought to the attention of the British Parliament, proper consideration has been refused and voted down by the majority.

The final disposition of this bill was reported in the public Press as follows:

“The House of Commons to-day (May 15, 1901) by 226 to 102 votes, rejected the second reading of the bill amending legal procedure in Ireland. Timothy Healy and other Nationalists vigorously denounced the system of packing juries obtaining, by which Catholics were placed outside the pale of the law. They advocated the abolition of grand juries and the Coercion Act, declaring that they would prefer open honest tyranny and the abolition of the right of trial by jury, to the present procedure.

The Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Atkinson, in replying, strongly condemned the bill. He said that so long as the Nationalist members of the House of Commons preached defiance of the law and approved of maiming and murdering jurors, it was absolutely necessary to use the power of jury selecting. Contempt of court was growing in Ireland daily, and the law required strengthening, rather than weakening.”

This statement in reference to the “growing contempt of Court” in Ireland is as equally devoid of truth as the remaining portion of this official’s objection to the bill. It would be difficult to show at what time within the English occupancy of Ireland the system of justice as usually administered was worthy of the respect of any man entitled to be considered an Irishman, while it has been denounced by many an honest Englishman.

The fact, often denied, is now fully established. England’s highest law official in Ireland has publicly acknowledged that the jury box has been regularly packed in that country by the Government officials and that the practice will be continued with the approval of the British Government is shown by the overwhelming vote in Parliament.

As no Irish member of Parliament “*approved of maiming and murdering jurors*” and as the fact is well established that since England was obliged to remove the troops for service against the Boers there has been less crime committed in Ireland than in any other country, while the people have proved that they are naturally, in every respect, a law-abiding race as Sir John Davis bore testimony three hundred years ago, further comment is unnecessary.

Mr. O’Connor in his speech before the House of Commons on

jury packing in Ireland stated: "What is the real test of Government? The first is the absolute separation of judicial and executive authority, and I say that the administration of justice in Ireland in addition to its wrongs, is this additional vice. That it has all the forms of law and all the realities of despotism. Govern Ireland that way if you think it is your duty—and I do not say your experiments in that way have been encouraging—but at all events avoid the miserable cowardice of pretending you are governing constitutionally. What does trial by jury mean? If the committee requires me to give a definition of jury-packing, I would remind it of the passage in Stevenson where one of the characters in the troublesome times in Scotland was asked to stand his trial. 'What,' said he (he was of the other clan), 'what, with MacCullum on the bench and twelve MacCullums in the jury-box?' That was a most excellent definition of jury-packing. It was trial of a man for a class offence by men of a different class, and if the offence was political, it was his trial by a jury consisting entirely of his political opponents.

"Jury-packing is not a new incident of Irish life, as some people seem to think. Jury-packing is practically a perennial and constant element of criminal administration in Ireland and I shall be able to show in the course of my observation that it is one of the justifications I shall have to give of the language used that jury-packing is an evil so ancient, deep rooted, and so frequently arraigned in this house and elsewhere in Irish life, that really the Irish people have come to a state of despair as to whether it can ever be remedied or removed at all."

NOTE XI

(From page 179, Vol. I.)

THE MEMOIRS OF WILLIAM SAMPSON, CRITICIZED FROM AN ENGLISH STANDPOINT

Mr. Sampson was a lawyer of Dublin who obtained the enmity of Government for defending Stockdale, the printer. He was also a sympathizer with the movement of the United Irishmen and was obliged to leave Ireland. He settled in New York and was well known as a prominent member of the bar for some years previous to his death. According to Lecky (*Ireland in the*

Eighteenth Century, vol. iv., p. 15, note): “*The book appears to me very mendacious and incredible!*” This criticism seems an unjust one and not in keeping with the character Mr. Sampson bore in after life. The writer has found no statement which has not been verified by the testimony of others and having been impressed with the truthfulness of the narrative he has made frequent extracts from it. In a general way Mr. Sampson's statements as to the cruelties practised by the troops are verified by the letters of the English commander-in-chief, General Abercrombie, to Dundas, written when he was about to resign in consequence of the double-dealing policy of the Government. In one of these he writes: “Within these twelve months every crime, every cruelty that could be committed by Cossacks or Calmucks has been transacted here.” Abercrombie resigned in disgust just before the “Rebellion” broke out, as he could not obtain the support of the Government in his effort to check the atrocities committed by the troops in accord with what is now known to have been the Government's policy.

NOTE XII

(From page 183, Vol. I.)

ENGLAND TO STRENGTHEN HER HOLD ON THE COUNTRY HAS KEPT
ALIVE RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE AND STRIFE IN IRELAND

Among the published letters of Thomas, Earl Strafford, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, we find one written July 19, 1634, to the Lord Treasurer of England, on the advantages arising from the policy of the Government in “*fomenting emulations*” between the Catholics and Protestants. He evidently was but reporting on the result of carrying out the instructions he had received. It may be added that under all parties it has been a settled purpose of the English Government to keep alive in Ireland religious prejudice. It has been England's strength in the past and has been exercised on all occasions, when it could be *judiciously* done, by granting some concession to the Catholics, for the purpose and with the effect of giving new life to the flames which were for the time but smouldering. Robert Emmet when on his trial said in his speech: “While the destruction of that Government

which upholds its dominion by impiety against the Most High, which displays its power over man as over the beasts of the field, which sets man upon his brother and lifts its hands in religion's name against the throats of his fellows who believe a little more or less than the Government standard, which reigns amidst the cries of the orphans and widows it has made. . . ." Here he was interrupted by the judge and not allowed to continue but sufficient was said to show what was the policy of the Government then and that it had not changed.

The English Government must stand charged with fostering religious intolerance not only in Ireland but in all her colonies and its presence in this country. It at no time adopted any measures, even in recent years, to discourage this intolerance in Ireland, hence it has been perpetuated generation after generation.

The Government in secret not only encouraged persecution of the Catholics in Ireland but it always protected afterwards those who were active therein, while showing no mercy to the Catholics who might turn in desperation and retaliate.

The Orange lodges exist, in all the English colonies, to keep alive the same intolerant spirit against the Catholic Irish and to maintain issues which should have ceased two hundred years ago. This organization of Orangemen exists even in the United States, where it certainly should have no place since an American citizen cannot openly persecute another without incurring responsibility; and they have no political interest or right here in maintaining a Protestant succession to the British Crown.

NOTE XIII

(From page 186, Vol. I.)

A PROTESTANT CLERGYMAN'S TESTIMONY IN REFERENCE TO CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

In the August number, 1901, of the *Nineteenth Century Magazine* can be found an article, "Down-trodden Irish Protestants, etc.," by John F. Taylor, K.C., a Protestant barrister of Dublin. This paper has been already referred to but it contains a letter from a Protestant clergyman, addressed to the *Freeman's Journal*, Dublin, which is of importance in relation to the subject treated of in the text:

“ ARDCANNY RECTORY, KIDIMO, CO. LIMERICK,

“ June 25, 1901.

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE *FREEMAN*.

“ DEAR SIR:

“ I have read with much regret the letter of Rev. T. B. Robertson in your issue of yesterday. While agreeing in many things with Mr. Robertson, I cannot help thinking that the methods adopted by him and his friends are often ill-advised and that their tone towards their Catholic fellow-countrymen is greatly to be deplored. When the feuds of former days are gradually being forgotten, surely every one who has the interest of religion and the best temporal interests of our country at heart ought to try to prevent those feuds from being, and not to fan the flames of sectarian animosity into fresh life.

“ For myself, I can say that I have been through almost every street in Limerick and have never received the slightest insult from any one, young or old. I have lived half my life in the south of Ireland, the last seven years being in the ultra-Catholic counties of Kerry and Limerick, yet I have never had the smallest difficulty in being on good terms with my neighbors; and my experience invariably has been that Protestants, and especially Protestant clergymen, who wish to do so can with perfect ease cultivate good relations with their countrymen of a different faith by simply making their rule of life the Divine precept, which tells us to do unto others as we would they should do unto us. I wish with all my soul that the converse could with truth be said of Belfast and some other places in the North.

“ If any Protestant clergy have been insulted in Limerick, I greatly fear they brought the insult on themselves, and that, like their friend, Dr. Long, they sought a little cheap martyrdom by courting an exhibition of hostile feeling as our ornate Chief Secretary would express it. Yours truly,

“ S. L. MAXWELL.”

NOTE XIV

(From page 198, Vol. I.)

THE NORTH CORK MILITIA REGIMENT IN 1798 : ITS CRIMES AND PUNISHMENT

This regiment was the first sent to County Wexford and quartered on the people. It arrived April 26th and as a direct result

of the debauchery, robbery, rape, murder and every other known crime, which were committed by these troops, the people were forced into a general outbreak on the following 26th of May. Every officer and man of the North Cork Militia became a marked object for vengeance and the men of Wexford were merciless in the punishment they inflicted upon all who came within their power.

Newenham states (page 273), in a note to the last quotation made from his work, that he had been a major in this organization some two years before the "Rebellion" and at that time "the Roman Catholics were to the Protestants as about two to one." This is the only disingenuous statement the writer has found in his work. He was too well informed a man to have been ignorant of the fact that no Catholic could hold a commission as an officer or was trusted by the Government in 1798. Every practical Catholic must have been weeded out because no Catholic regiment, if such existed at the time, would have been sent on this mission, for the reason stated above.

In the same note the author adds: "This regiment lost about one-third of its number, or about two hundred men during the rebellion, and, as the writer has since been credibly informed, was never in the least degree disgraced either by rebellious or mutinous practices or principles." This was doubtless true as no regiment could have done more to carry out fully the wishes of the English Government. But that Newenham could have been ignorant of the crimes committed by this body of men is incredible. But this spirit pervades all "Irish history" written from an English standpoint.

NOTE XV

(From page 210, Vol. I.)

CONDUCT OF ENGLISH ARMY OFFICERS IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, AFTER CONSIDERING THEIR COURSE IN IRELAND

Governor Livingston thus spoke of the English troops who had recently overrun that section of country: "They have plundered friends and foes; effects capable of division, they have divided; such as were not they have destroyed; they have warred on decrepit old age, warred on defenceless youth; they have com-

mitted hostilities against the professors of literature and the ministers of religion, against public records, and private monuments; books of improvement and papers of curiosity; and against the arts and sciences. They have butchered the wounded, asking for quarter; mangled the dead, weltering in their blood; refusing to the dead the rites of sepulture; suffering prisoners to perish for want of sustenance; insulting the persons of females; disfiguring private dwellings of taste and elegance, and in their rage of impiety and barbarism, profaned edifices dedicated to Almighty God."

At the close of the American Revolution, Gov. John Rutledge of South Carolina showed that the English troops from the beginning to the end of the war had been guilty of the same excesses and cruelty charged by Governor Livingston.

In an address to the Assemblage of South Carolina in session at Jacksonborough, February, 1782, Governor Rutledge made the following statement¹: "Regardless of the sacred ties of honor, destitute of the feelings of humanity, and determined to extinguish, if possible, every spark of freedom in this country, the enemy, with the insolent pride of conquerors, gave unbounded scope to the exercise of their tyrannical disposition, infringing their public engagements, and violated the most solemn engagements. Many of our worthiest citizens, without cause, were long and closely confined—some on board of prison-ships, and others in the town and castle of St. Augustine; their properties disposed of at the will and caprice of the enemy, and their families sent to a different and distant part of the continent, without the means of support. Many who had surrendered prisoners of war, were killed in cold blood. Several suffered death in the most ignominious manner, and others were delivered up to savages, and put to tortures, under which they expired. Thus the lives, liberties, and properties of the people were dependent solely on the pleasure of the British officers, who deprived them of either or all, on the most frivolous pretences. Indians, slaves, and a desperate banditti of the most profligate characters, were carried and employed by the enemy to execute their infamous purposes.

¹ *Anecdotes of the American Revolution*, etc., by Alexander Garden, Brooklyn reprint, 1865, vol. ii., p. 242.

“Devastation and ruin marked their progress, and that of their adherents; nor was their violence restrained by the charms or influence of beauty and innocence; even the fair sex, whom it is the duty of all and the pleasure and pride of the brave to protect, they and their tender offspring, were victims of the inveterate malice of an unrelenting foe. Neither the tears of mothers, nor the cries of infants, could excite in their breasts pity or compassion. Not only the peaceful habitations of the widow, the aged and the infirm, but the holy temples of the Most High were consumed in flames, kindled by their sacrilegious hands. They have tarnished the glory of the British arms, disgraced the profession of a British soldier, and fixed indelible stigmas of rapine, cruelty, perfidy, and profaneness on the British name.”

NOTE XVI

(From page 217, Vol. I.)

NOTICE OF MISS EMMET, AFTERWARDS THE WIFE OF ROBERT HOLMES—HER DEATH

Miss Mary Anne Emmet was a woman of remarkable talents and attainments. She was a frequent writer for the Press and many of her articles bore evidence of a profound knowledge of both finance and political economy. She always wrote anonymously and some of her more lengthy articles, on the political issues of the day, had a very large circulation in pamphlet form. She married Robert Holmes, of Dublin, “father of the North East Bar.” Mr. Holmes had been absent in England on business and unfortunately arrived in Dublin the night of the “outbreak” under Robert Emmet. He was ignorant of Emmet’s movements and on the way home after his arrival he was recognized in the street by the police, arrested and imprisoned. His wife remained in ignorance of his fate beyond the fact of his arrival and his supposed arrest. After a confinement of a year or more Mr. Holmes was released and going to his house rang the bell for admission. Unfortunately his wife had but just entered the house and turning she opened the door—to fall dead in her husband’s arms.

This incident has not only been held as a family tradition but

confirmed by the statement of Sir Bernard Burke. On one occasion he informed the writer that the room in which he had his private office, as king-at-arms in the John's Tower, Dublin Castle, was the one in which Mr. Holmes had been confined; he also then cited the fact of the sudden death of Mrs. Holmes in the manner described.

NOTE XVII

(From page 231, Vol. I.)

NAMES OF THOSE WHO VOTED FOR THE UNION—THE “COMPENSATION” FOR EACH VOTE

Barrington states: “The observations annexed to the names of these lists were at the time, either in actual proof, or sufficiently notorious to have been printed in various documents at that epoch.”

ORIGINAL BLACK LIST

1. R. Aldrige. An English clerk in the Secretary's office; no connection with Ireland.
2. Henry Alexander. Chairman of Ways and Means; cousin of Lord Caledon; his brother made Bishop; himself Colonial Secretary at the Cape of Good Hope.
3. Richard Archdall. Commissioner of the Board of Works.
4. William Bailey. Commissioner of the Board of Works.
5. Rt. Hon. J. Beresford. First Commissioner of Revenue; brother-in-law to Lord Clare.
6. J. Beresford, Jr. Then Purse-bearer to Lord Clare, afterwards a parson, and now Lord Decies.
7. Marcus Beresford. A Colonel in the Army, son to the Bishop, Lord Clare's nephew.
8. J. Bingham.¹ Created a Peer; got £8000 for two seats and £15,000 compensation for Tuam. This gentleman first offered himself for *sale* to the Anti-Unionist, Lord Clanmorris.
9. Jos. H. Blake. Created a Peer—Lord Wallscourt, etc.

¹ Barrington states in a note he was “deputed to learn from Mr. Bingham what his expectations from Government for his seats were: he proposed to take from the Opposition £8000 for his two seats, £15,000 for Tuam and oppose the Union. Government afterwards added a peerage and £55,000 for the borough!”

10. Sir J. G. Blackwood. Created a Peer—Lord Dufferin.
11. Sir John Blaquiere. Numerous offices and pensions, and created a Peer—Lord Blaquiere.
12. Anthony Botet. Appointed Commissioner of the Barrack Board, £500 a year.
13. Colonel Burton. Brother to Lord Conyngham; a Colonel in the Army.
14. Sir Richard Butler. Purchased and changed sides: voted *against* the Union in 1799, and for it in 1800. Cash.
15. Lord Boyle. Son of Lord Shannon: they got an immense sum of money for their seats and boroughs at £15,000 each borough.¹
16. Rt. Hon. D. Brown. Brother to Lord Sligo.
17. Stewart Bruce. Gentleman Usher at Dublin Castle; now a Baronet.
18. George Burdet. Commissioner of a Public Board, £500 per annum.
19. George Bunbury. Commissioner of a Public Board, £500 per annum.
20. Arthur Brown. Changed *sides and principles* and was appointed Sergeant; in 1799 opposed the Union and supported it in 1800; he was senior Fellow of Dublin University; lost his seat the ensuing election, and died.
21. Bagwall, Sen. *Changed twice*: got the patronage of Tipperary; his son a Dean, etc., etc.
22. Bagwell, Jun. *Changed twice*: got the Tipperary Regiment, etc.
23. Wm. Bagwell. His brother.
24. Lord Castlereagh. The Irish Minister.
25. George Cavendish. Secretary of the Treasury during pleasure: son of Sir Henry.
26. Sir H. Cavendish. Receiver-General during pleasure: deeply indebted to the Crown.
27. Sir R. Chinnery. Placed in office after the Union.
28. James Cane. Renegaded, and got a pension.
29. Thos. Casey. A Commissioner of Bankrupts under Lord Clare; made a city magistrate.

¹ It has already been stated that Lord Shannon received for his patronage in the Commons £55,000!

30. Col. C. Cope. Renegaded: got a regiment and the patronage of his country.
31. Gen. Cradock. Returned to Government: much military rank; now Lord Howden.
32. James Crosby. A regiment and the patronage of Kerry, jointly; seconded the Address.
34. Charles H. Coote. Obtained a regiment (which was taken from Col. Wharburton); patronage of Queen's County, and a peerage (Lord Castlecoote) and £7500 in cash for his interest at the borough of Maryborough, in which, in fact, it was *proved* before the commissioners that the author (Barrington) of this work had more interest than his Lordship.
35. Rt. Hon. J. Corry. Appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer, on dismissal of Sir John Parnell.
36. Sir J. Cotter. Privately bought over by cash.
37. Richard Cotter.
38. Hon. H. Creighton. Renegaded; privately purchased.
39. Hon. J. Creighton. Renegaded; privately purchased.
40. W. A. Crosbie. Comptroller to the Lord Lieutenant's household.
41. James Cuffe. Natural son to Mr. Cuffe of the Board of Works; his father created Lord Tyrawly.
42. General Dunne. Returned for Maryborough by the united influence of Lord Castlecoote and Government, to keep out Mr. Barrington; gained the election by only *one*.
43. Wm. Elliot. Secretary of the Castle.
44. Gen. Eustace. A regiment.
45. Lord C. Fitzgerald. Duke of Leinster's brother; a pension and a peerage; a sea officer of no repute.
46. Rt. Hon. W. Fitzgerald.
47. Sir C. Fatescue. Renegaded officer; king-at-arms.
48. A. Fergusson. Got a place at the Barrack Board, £500 a year and a baronetcy.
49. Luke Fox. Appointed Judge of Common Pleas; nephew by marriage to Lord Ely.
50. Wm. Fortescue. Got a secret pension out of the fund (£3000 a year) entrusted by Parliament to the Irish Government, solely to reward Mr. Reynolds, Cope, etc., etc., and those who informed against the rebels.

51. J. Galbraith. Lord Abercorn's attorney; got a baronetage.
52. Henry D. Grady. First Counsel to the Commissioners.
53. Rich. Hare. Put two members into Parliament and was created Lord Ennismore for their votes.
54. Wm. Hare. His son.
55. Col. B. Henniker. A regiment and paid £3500 for his seat by the Commissioners of Compensation.
56. Peter Holmes. A Commissioner of Stamps.
57. George Hatton. Appointed Commissioner of Stamps.
58. Hon. J. Hutchinson. A General—Lord Hutchinson.
59. Hugh Howard. Lord Wicklow's brother; made Postmaster-General.
60. Wm. Hancock (Athlone). An extraordinary instance: he made and sang songs *against* the Union in 1799, at a public dinner of the Opposition, and made and sang songs *for* it in 1800; he got a peerage.
61. John Hobson. Appointed storekeeper at the Castle Ordnance.
62. Col. G. Jackson. A regiment.
63. Denham Jephson. Master of Horse to the Lord Lieutenant.
64. Hon. G. Jocelyn. Promoted in the Army, and his brother created Bishop of Lismore.
65. Wm. Jones.
66. Theophilus Jones. A collector of Dublin.
67. Major-General Jackson. A regiment.
68. Wm. Johnson. Returned to Parliament by Lord Castlereagh, as he himself declared "to put an end to it." Appointed a judge since.
69. Robt. Johnson. Seceded from his patron, Lord Downshire, and was appointed a judge.
70. John Keane. A renegade; got a pension.
71. Garries Kearny. Returned by Lord Clifton, being his attorney; got an office.
72. Henry Kemmis. Son of the Crown Solicitor.
73. Wm. Knot. Appointed a Commissioner of Appeals, £800 a year.
74. Andrew Knox.
75. Colonel Keatinge.
76. Rt. Hon. Sir H. Langrishe. A Commissioner of the Rev-

- enue; received £15 000 cash for his patronage at Knoc-topher.
77. T. Lindsay, Sen. Commissioner of Stamps; paid £1500 for his patronage.
 78. T. Lindsay, Jun. Usher of the Castle; paid £1500 for his patronage.
 79. L. Longfield. Created a Peer—Lord Longueville.
 80. Capt. J. Longfield. Appointed to the office of Ship Entries of Dublin, taken from Sir Jonah Barrington.
 81. Lord Loftus. Son of Lord Ely, Postmaster-General; got £30,000 for their boroughs, and created an English Marquis.
 82. General Lake. An Englishman (no connection with Ireland) returned by Lord Castlereagh, solely to vote for the Union.
 83. Right Hon. Dav. Latouche.
 84. General Loftus. A General; got a regiment; cousin to Lord Ely.
 85. Francis McNamara. Cash, and a private pension, paid by Lord Castlereagh.
 86. Ross Mahon. Several appointments and places by Government.
 87. Richard Martin. Commissioner of Stamps.
 88. Right Hon. Monk Mason. A Commissioner of Revenue.
 89. H. D. Massey. Received £4000 cash.
 90. Thos. Mahon.
 91. A. E. McNaghten. Appointed a Lord of the Treasury, etc.
 92. Stephen Moore. A Postmaster at will.
 93. N. M. Moore.
 94. Right Hon. Lodge Morris. Created a Peer.
 95. Sir R. Musgrave. Appointed Receiver of the Customs, £1000 a year.
 96. Jas. M'Cleland. A barrister—appointed Solicitor-General and then Baron of the Exchequer.
 97. Col. G. McDonnel. Commissioner of Imprest Accounts, £500 per annum.
 98. Rich. Magenness. Commissioner of Imprest Accounts, £500 per annum.
 99. Thos. Nesbit. A pensioner at will.

100. Sir W. G. Newcomen, Bart. Bought (see *Nemoirs, ante*), and a peerage for his wife.
101. Rich. Neville. Renegaded; reinstated as Teller of the Exchequer.
102. Wm. Odell. A regiment; and Lord of the Treasury.
103. Chas. Osborne. A barrister; appointed a Judge of the King's Bench.
104. C. M. Ormsby. Appointed First Council Commissioner.
105. Adm'l Pakenham. Master of the Ordinance.
106. Colonel Pakenham. A regiment; killed at New Orleans.
107. H. S. Prittie. A peerage; Lord Dunalley.
108. R. Penefather.
109. T. Prendergast. An officer in the Court of Chancery, £500 a year; his brother Crown Solicitor.
110. Sir Rich. Quin. A peerage.
111. Sir Boyle Roche. Gentleman Usher at the Castle.
112. R. Rutledge.
113. Hon. C. Rowley. Renegaded and appointed to office by Lord Castlereagh.
114. Hon. H. Skeffington. Clerk of the Paper Office of the Castle and £7500 for his patronage.
115. Wm. Smith. A barrister; appointed a Baron of Exchequer.
116. H. M. Sanford. Created a Peer—Lord Mount Sanford.
117. Edmond Stanley. Appointed a Commissioner of Accounts.
118. John Staples.
119. John Stewart. Appointed Attorney-General and created a baronet.
120. John Stratton.
121. Hon. B. Stratford. Renegaded to get £7500, his half of the compensation for Balinglass.
122. Hon. G. Stratford. Paymaster of Foreign Forces, £1300 a year and £7500 for Balinglass.
123. Rich. Sharkey. An obscure barrister; appointed a county judge.
124. Thos. Stannus. Renegaded.
125. J. Savage.
126. Rt. Hon. J. Toler. Attorney-General; his wife, an old woman, created a Peeress; himself made Chief Justice, and a Peer.

- 127. Frederick Trench. Appointed a Commissioner of the Board of Works.
- 128. Hon. R. Trench. A barrister; created a Peer and made an Ambassador.
- 129. Charles Trench. His brother; appointed Commissioner of Inland Navigation, a new office created by Lord Cornwallis, for rewards.
- 130. Rich. Talbot.
- 131. P. Tottenham. Compensated for patronage; cousin and politically connected with Lord Ely.
- 132. Lord Tyrone. One hundred and four offices in the gift of his family; proposed the Union in Parliament, by a speech written in the crown of his hat.
- 133. Charles Tottenham. In office.
- 134. — Tounsend. A Commissioner.
- 135. Robt. Tighe. Commissioner of Barracks.
- 136. Robt. Uniack. A Commissioner connected with Lord Clare.
- 137. Jas. Verner. Called the Prince of Orange.
- 138. J. O. Vandeleur. Commissioner of the Revenue; his brother a judge.
- 139. Col. Wemyss. Collector of Kilkenny.
- 140. Henry Westensaw. Father of Lord Rossmore, who is of the very reverse of his father's politics.

Barrington's comment on the men whose names form this "Black List" is as follows: "As to the House of Lords the servile—almost miraculous—submission with which they surrendered their hereditary prerogative, honours, rights, and dignities, into the hands of Lord Clare and Castlereagh, is a subject unprecedented."

One ignorant of the facts would be surprised to find on investigation how many of the titles and how much of the wealth of the present "Irish Nobility," who form a portion of the English garrison in Ireland, can be traced directly to corruption and bribery for the purchase of a vote for the "Union" with England, just one hundred years ago. Their ancestors were as a rule in full sympathy with one of the actors of the day who thanked God that he had a country to sell. In every other

country but Ireland the nobility have more or less in common with the people. The descendants of those who thus betrayed their country are a marked class of people, who so long as they are sustained by English influence will continue to subsist on the country and can never become again identified with the people nor with the general interests of the nation. They, with their kinsmen, who form the average landlord class, on parting with their landed property, which is overburdened with debt, are doomed to emigrate at some future day unless they become Irishmen *in fact*. Possibly the English Government will continue to reward them elsewhere for past services. In addition to those who were paid directly for their services, a large number were pensioned with annuities charged to the Irish Tax list for every conceivable degree of damage and it is most probable that their descendants are still receiving these annuities, under some plea, to the detriment of the Irish taxpayer.

Barrington adds the following statement in a foot-note (page 436): "The extraordinary claims for compensation and some extraordinary grants by the Commissioners, would, on any other occasion be a fit subject for ridicule. But the application of one million and a half sterling to purposes so public and so vile, renders it an eternal blot on the Government in Ireland. . . . Among other curious claims for Union *compensations*, in the report *printed* and *circulated*, appears one from the Lord Lieutenant's Rat-catcher at the Castle, for decrease of employment; another from the '*Necessary woman*' of the Privy Council of England, for the increased trouble in her department, with numerous others of the same quality!"

NOTE XVIII

(From page 255, Vol. I.)

THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO WHICH IRELAND WAS ENTITLED AFTER THE UNION

Newenham writes as follows on the representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament: "The number of representatives for Ireland ought to have been adjusted to the population and wealth of the country conjunctively: or rather more to the former than to the latter; inasmuch as national wealth is more likely to

be increased under a good government, in proportion to the number of people, than the number of people in proportion to the augmentation of wealth.

“ But to ascertain either the population or the wealth of Ireland, or to attain a competent knowledge of them, required a much more minute and comprehensive investigation than appears to have been taken.

“ In order to adjust the number of representatives for Ireland to her population, recourse appears to have been had to the returns of the hearth-money collectors in 1791; and in order to adjust that number to her wealth, recourse was had to her exports, imports, and public revenue: rejecting or overlooking her rental, which was at least as fit a criterion as any of these.

“ By the returns of the hearth-money collectors, in 1791, there appeared to be 701,102 houses in Ireland; and from thence was inferred the existence of a population of four millions, in the year 1800. That population compared with the population of Britain, as it appeared after the accurate enumeration completed in 1801, when Britain, by the way, was found to contain more people than that country had generally been previously supposed to contain, entitled Ireland to 202 representatives.

“ By a return of the value of the exports of native produce and manufacture, agreeable to the prices current, on an average of three years ended 25th of March, 1799, Ireland was found to have exported to the amount of 5,650,853 pounds, and by a similar return, on an average of three years ended 5th of January, 1799, Britain was found to have exported to the amount of 31,272,865 pounds. The number of representatives to which Ireland seemed, by this comparison, entitled, was 100. By return of imports on the foregoing averages, Ireland was found to have imported to the amount of 5,275,063 pounds; of which she exported to the amount of 133,522 pounds; retaining, for home consumption, to the amount of 5,141,541; and Britain was found to have imported to the amount of 42,689,108, of which she exported to the amount of 11,865,029 pounds, retaining for home consumption to the amount of 30,824,079 pounds. The number of representatives indicated for Ireland, by this comparison, was 93.

“ By returns of the net permanent revenues of both countries,

paid into the exchequer, on an average of the years before mentioned, that of Ireland appeared to be 1,860,797 pounds, and that of Britain 26,348,794 pounds; so that, in proportion to public revenue, Ireland could claim only 39 representatives.

“The number of representatives to which Ireland appeared entitled, by all these returns, taken on an average, was 108. In allowing her, therefore, 100 representatives, principles of equity appeared to be sufficiently adhered to; but in reality it was far otherwise.

“For first, the returns of the hearth-money collectors had always to be considered under the truth. The Inspector-General of hearth-money gave it as his decided opinion to the writer of these pages, that not more than one-half of the houses exempt from the hearth-tax was returned; consequently the population contained in 111,556 houses, amounting certainly to upwards of half a million, was overlooked. Besides, no allowance was made for the increase of people from the year 1791 to the year 1800, which was evidently great. The direct loss, occasioned by the rebellion, certainly did not exceed 20,000 souls; even if the number of those, who voluntarily quitted their country, be added to that of those who were exiled or slain. Moreover, the population of Britain appears to have been taken at eleven millions; though it was not known to amount to that number, till after the Union, and was generally supposed to be much less before it. Had the people of Ireland been carefully enumerated, they positively would have been found to exceed four millions and a half at least; and consequently Ireland might have claimed, with reference to her population, at least 228 representatives instead of 202.

“Secondly, it was unfair to take the exports of a country among whose exports, provisions of different sorts held so conspicuous a place, as is the case with Ireland, during a period of three years, when she had to support an army unprecedentedly great. Had the value of the exports of the native produce and manufactures of Ireland, on an average of three years, ended in 1792, and which amounted, according to the official value,¹ to

¹ “The writer has not seen an account of the current value of the articles exported during this period. Foreign goods are included in the exports of Ireland; but their amount has always been extremely trivial, not exceeding

5,061,913 pounds; being taken and compared with those of Britain during the same period, and which amounted to 15,173,202 pounds, Ireland might, with reference to exports, have claimed 179 representatives.

“Thirdly, it was unfair to take the imports of Ireland, during three years, whereof one was distinguished by rebellion and the other two by unequalled alarm; as under such circumstances, people will certainly not purchase so largely, as during the prevalence of internal peace and exemption from apprehension. Had the imports of Ireland, during the period ending in 1792, and which amounted to 4,079,906 pounds, been compared with those of Britain, during the same period, and which amounted to 13,530,532 pounds, deducting therefrom the foreign articles afterwards exported, Ireland would have appeared to have a claim, on this ground, to 168 representatives.

“Fourthly, it was perfectly unjustifiable to resort to the net, instead of the gross revenues of both countries, the charges on the revenue of Ireland having been much greater than those on the revenue of Britain: and the expenses of collection infinitely more so. The balance likewise in the hands of the collectors of the Irish revenue, have always been, beyond all comparison, greater, in proportion, than those in the hands of the collectors of the British revenue. This, even at present, is the case. The amount of the former, in the year ending 5th of last January, was 325,231 pounds seven shillings and $4\frac{3}{4}$ pence; which, to the amount of the gross receipt of the Irish revenue, was about one to seventeen. The amount of the latter, in the same year, was 346,611 pounds eighteen shillings and two and a half pence; which, to the amount of the gross receipts of the British revenue, was as about one to one hundred and twenty-two. But to the revenue of Ireland, whether gross or net, it was most unfair to resort; the collection of that revenue having been singularly defective, as was well known; and the national debt, demanded an increase of revenue, having been trivial in the year ended 25th of March, 1799, in comparison of what it was ever likely to be, and really was even in the following year.”

“The net ordinary revenue of Britain, in the last year, was 150,338 pounds, on an average of the last five years, and not exceeding 25,931 pounds, on an average of ten years ending in 1782.”

38,339,152 pounds; the net ordinary revenue of Ireland, 5,896,818 pounds. To adjust the number of representatives, therefore, of the latter, to the proportion of her revenue to that of the former, the number should be 85, instead of 38, which appeared to be the just proportion at the time of the Union.

“ But the rentals of the respective countries ought to have been resorted to, as criterions of their wealth, equally with, or rather in preference to their public revenues, or any other criterion. Had this been the case, the number of representatives claimable by Ireland, with reference to rental, would have been about 186; her rental then, being certainly as near fifteen millions, as that of Britain was near forty-five.

“ The number of representatives for Ireland, then, if fairly proportioned to population and wealth, ought to have been 150, at the least, instead of 100: the number claimable, with reference to population, being 228; with reference to exports, 179; with reference to imports, 168; with reference to revenue, 85, and with reference to rental, 186; the average of all which is $169\frac{1}{2}$.”¹

Battersby on this subject states²: “ Again taking the population of 1821, the proportion of Irishmen capable of bearing arms, was 1,664,437, and that of Great Britain, 2,928,951; which is 3 to 5, or as a military population, $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 3; so that if Great Britain has 553 members, Ireland on this principle should have 314—taking the present population (1833), the men in Ireland capable of bearing arms, are about 2,000,000, which should give Ireland a still greater representation.”

NOTE XIX

(From page 29, Vol. II.)

IRISHMEN IN THE ENGLISH ARMY—BRITISH OFFICERS OF NOTE ARE
GENERALLY OF IRISH BIRTH—DURING THE PAST CENTURY
THE GREATER PORTION OF THE ENLISTED MEN IN BOTH THE
ARMY AND NAVY HAVE BEEN IRISHMEN

The statements of Wolfe Tone, Grattan and other Irish leaders confirm the views expressed by Mr. Emmet. Without having

¹ Newenham, p. 285.

² Battersby, p. 149.

the data at hand to verify the assertion, it is believed by the writer that Mr. Emmet's statement was equally as applicable to the number of Irish in the British Army up to a recent period, while the impression exists that the number has not yet decreased so much in the Navy. The Irish and Scotch have for the past hundred and fifty years or more fought England's battles and neither nationality has received due credit. Among the officers who have gained distinction in the field or afloat those of English birth have formed but a small proportion of the whole in comparison with the population of the two countries; while by far the greater number of those known to fame, among the Wellingtons and the Nelsons of the British service, have been of Irish birth or of Irish parentage. Yet this fact is too frequently suppressed in the general claims made for English superiority. It is true that they were not Catholics for, while legally no difference could exist, the Government has always had a care that no Catholics should ever be placed in such a position of trust—loyalty, honesty and worth being of secondary consideration in comparison to the religious test; yet they were Irish nevertheless, as are Wolseley, Roberts, White, Kitchener and others who are in command of British forces at the present time. The Catholic Irish, however, have always been eagerly sought for as soldiers and in past years they have been enlisted in the regiments which were generally believed to be formed of English exclusively or Scotch. "The Gordon Highlanders" was one of the most famous fighting regiments in the British Army and was believed to be composed of Scotchmen; yet it has been recently shown that fully forty per cent. of the regiment were Irishmen and even the piper was of that nationality!

There are no longer any Highlanders to recruit the army, as the Highlands have been turned into deer and other game ranges and Ireland has become too depleted of men by starvation and forced emigration. England is now beginning to receive the first fruits of her selfish policy towards Ireland as, according to the published accounts at the close of the nineteenth century, she had not over twenty-five thousand Irishmen in her army (which number was not more than one-ninth of her whole available force) instead of there being over one-half Irish, as the proportion has been during the past hundred years. Her chief reliance in India,

and to some extent elsewhere, is on the native troops who as soon as they appreciate the situation will in all probability begin a movement which will ultimately result in England's retirement from India. The militia system of England is imposing on paper, but for service it is probably the most defective of any country in Europe. She has, however, more ready money than her neighbors, which will serve her to good purpose so long as she is able to hire mercenaries; but when she has to depend upon the trades-people of her towns she will retrograde as an empire.

NOTE XX

(From page 104, Vol. II.)

THE IRISH HARVESTERS IN GREAT BRITAIN

(From the New York *Irish World*, February 21, 1903)

VAST NUMBERS OF PEASANTS WHO ARE COMPELLED TO SPEND HALF A YEAR IN A FOREIGN LAND TO EARN BREAD FOR THEIR WIVES AND FAMILIES—A PITIFUL BUT SUBLIME SPECTACLE—A STRIKING ILLUSTRATION OF THE IRISHMAN'S UNDYING LOVE FOR HIS NATIVE LAND—AWFUL SUFFERING HE ENDURES TO KEEP TOGETHER A WRETCHED PLACE THAT CANNOT SUPPORT HIM AND HIS.

In one of Mr. Hugh Sutherland's admirable letters to the Philadelphia *North American*, that able correspondent thus tells the pitiful but sublime story of the Irish harvester in Great Britain:

"On my first trip to the West a few weeks ago I was rather astonished to find that the train consisted of more than a dozen carriages, and that the third-class compartments were crowded with sturdy-looking men. Having heard of the poverty of the districts into which I was going, I was not prepared to see such heavy passenger traffic. Surely these men had not been away for a holiday?"

"At the junction station I was able to talk to some of them on the platform while we waited for a connecting train. A broad-shouldered, bearded man, with a heavy bundle hanging on his shoulder, cheerfully enlightened me.

“ ‘ Sure, sir, we ’ve all been over in England workin’, ’ he said. ‘ Some have been gone three months, some six. I ’ve been away since April myself, and there ’s twenty good pounds in me pocket this blessed minyit for to pay the rint an’ buy a bit of bacon an’ that for the winter. ’

“ SPENDING HALF A YEAR IN A FOREIGN LAND TO GET THE MEANS
OF SUBSISTENCE

“ ‘ But what do you go to England for? Why not stay on your own farm and work that? ’

“ ‘ Aye, why not? Sure, you ’re a nice-spoken gintleman, but beggin’ yer pardon, it ’s little you know of our country. I can see that. Why don’t we stay here? God save you, sir, an’ do you think we go to England because we like it? Is it likely we ’d leave our own farms if so be we ’d get food an’ clothes an’ rint by stayin’? Bad luck to it, we go because we have to. My boy ’s away in America, so there ’s only the old woman an’ me, an’ I have to leave half the year an’ work in a furrin land—England, mind ye—to get the money we need. ’

“ ‘ Then why not go to England altogether? ’

“ The big man turned and looked over the desolate country. The winter dusk was falling swiftly, and the outlines of the hills were indistinct, but we could still see the empty land and feel its rugged unkindness. Yet the man’s voice was very tender as he spoke.

“ ‘ Twenty miles on, ’ he said, ‘ there ’s a bit of a cabin and a bit of land. In that cabin I was born and on that land my father worked. Is it like, now, that I ’d leave it to live in England or anywhere else? Man, have ye got a home? It ’s a rough place at the best and not all the muscles I ’ve got can dig a livin’ out of it. But, God be good to me, I love it, sir. ’

“ I learned much more at other times from men and writings concerning this yearly migration of the workers, but the great truth of it lay in the simple words of this rugged toiler. They love their land, these Irish! With a depth we may not measure, with a fervency we cannot feel, they love the land they have never owned, the land which they have found so cruel.

“ It is so pitiful, yet so sublime. For centuries these people

have been serfs of the alien race which conquered them. They have toiled in summer heat and winter storms to keep life in their own bodies and give luxuries to those above them. Perhaps this is why their devotion to the soil is so passionate. Forbidden by precedent and law to own the ground where they were born, living only as occupiers of it by pleasure of their employers, they have clung to it through hope and despair. And it was as much this love of the land as hatred of oppression which made them burst into lawlessness in the old days when tyranny was most bitter.

“Consider what they do. They occupy little barren patches, where even with prosperous seasons life is a struggle. They know they cannot, howsoever great their industry, feed and clothe themselves from the products of the soil. They know that every spring the strongest of the family must go away and work among strangers. Yet when the hard task is over, when they have painfully saved the pennies earned, they come back to the old places and fight through the cruel winter with the earnings of their sacrifice.

“We call it patriotism when a crowd cheers a flag or a song. How many such careless patriots would suffer absence from home for half the year in order to keep together a wretched place that would not support them?

“Years ago I saw an actor—the venerable Joseph Murphy—in one of his Irish plays. He sang a song of Ireland:

“ ‘T is a handful of earth
From the land of my birth,
From the grave where my dear mother lies.’

“It seemed bathos to me, and I wondered at the tumultuous applause which greeted the simple lines. I do not wonder now. Desolate hillside or dreary bog, the Irish love the land of their birth as no other race does.

“But I started to write about migration, that great, unnatural tide of travel that sweeps towards England and Scotland in the spring and flows back again in the late fall. If there were no other condition arguing the poverty induced by the present land system, surely this would be conclusive.

“According to returns compiled by the Board of Trade, 24,438

persons migrated from Connaught alone this year. It is estimated that they brought back average earnings of \$37.50, or a total of \$916,425. That amounts to 27½ per cent. of the entire rent of the province, and has to be earned outside of the country. There are 31,873 families in Connaught whose holdings are worth less than \$20 a year.

“Therefore nearly every one of these families had to send a member to England to earn the necessities of life for the winter.

“A few facts regarding definite localities will illustrate how grievous is the condition which entails this unnatural system of migratory labor. One priest in Donegal reported a few years ago that out of seven thousand persons in his parish, one thousand had to spend several months of each year away from home. Some went to the more prosperous counties in the East of Ireland, the greater number to England. From the district of Rathmore, Kerry, the priest reported two hundred to three hundred girls left in the middle of March and did not return until December 1st.

“Perhaps the worst feature of the system is that it does not spare the women, nor even the children. A special correspondent of the London *Times* reported that the migrants included ‘practically every man, boy, and girl able to work.’

“‘It cannot be regarded as satisfactory or desirable,’ he said, ‘to perpetuate a social condition in which it is needful for children of ages varying from nine to fifteen years to leave their homes and be employed chiefly in agricultural work in distant places without care or oversight.’

“As to the mode of travel and the life, a Board of Trade report says that the young men and women are usually hired by an agent.

“‘He collects and takes over a gang. He accompanies them from farm to farm, and makes all arrangements for travelling. Employers frequently find accommodation for the men and also for the women, in barns, or in temporary tents, though if the farms are near towns the Irish laborers often find their own lodgings.’

“AN IRISH GIRL’S AWFUL EXPERIENCE

“There is rare human interest in the testimony of one girl, given before a Royal Commission. Asked to describe her experiences,

she said she arrived in Paisley, Scotland, and found an eight-cent lodging for the night. Next morning she started on a tramp through the country. After working for eight days on farms near by, she took a train to another district, where she obtained employment for a month, digging potatoes, sleeping at night with several other Irish girls in an outbuilding. With seven others, from her own district, she went on into Perthshire and worked in the potato fields for five weeks more. So her story ran on. The work was not excessively hard, she said, but they were exposed to much wet weather, and some of the girls were taken ill.

"This girl was fifteen years old when she wandered about a strange country doing the work of a man and sleeping in barns. Another girl, eighteen years old, testified that she had gone to Scotland for four successive years, and her sixteen-year-old sister had been there twice. An assistant commissioner on the Royal Commission on Labor reported that he knew of two girls, one eleven years old, the other thirteen, who had travelled all through England, working as farm laborers. Every year ten thousand Irish girls must face this terrible experience.

"I have just mentioned, in the merest outline, some of the conditions which face these devoted people. As to the cause, I quote a commission which sat more than twenty years ago. It treated this migration exhaustively, and said it was due '(1) to the extreme smallness of many of the land holdings, and (2) to the overcrowding of population in districts of poor land, where the occupants often depend for a livelihood upon employment during a portion of the year in Great Britain.'

"If the reader will remember that we are talking of human beings, of women and children, he will find nothing 'dry' in the formal reports and figures dealing with this question. The Bessborough Commission stated:

" A FEARFUL CONDITION OF AFFAIRS

" 'The condition of the poorer tenants in numerous parts of Ireland, where it is said they are not able, if they had the land gratis, to live by cultivating it, is, by some, thought to be an almost unsolvable problem.'

“The O'Connor Don, a member of that commission, added this:

“‘There are portions of Ireland in which the land is so bad and so thickly populated that the questions of tenure and rent are mere trifles. If the present occupiers had the land forever and for nothing they could not, in the best of years, live decently, and in bad years they must be in a state of starvation.’

“The secretary of the Congested Districts Board said that the holdings rented by the migratory laborers are so small that ‘they could not live if they did not make money from migratory labor. Their farms would not support them.’

“Mr. B. W. Coyne, superintendent of statistics in the Department of Agriculture, wrote two years ago:

“‘They (the migratory laborers) are not, properly speaking, agricultural laborers at all. They are as a class small landholders or the wives, sons and daughters of small landholders. Were it not for the annual migration to England and Scotland, these poor people, low as their standard of comfort is, certainly could not make ends meet.’

“The Congested Districts Board report says:

“‘In a good year they are little more than free from the dread of hunger, while a complete or partial failure of their crop involves, as a consequence, proportionately greater or less suffering from insufficient food.’

“Now for some eloquent figures concerning the migration in this year, 1902. From Mayo County, 18,838 men went to England and Scotland. They represented thirty-six per cent. of the adult male population and forty-five per cent. of the adult population engaged in agriculture. The figures from some of the districts are even more startling. The following table shows the migration from the districts named and the percentage of the total adult male population represented:

	MIGRANTS	PER CENT.
Swinford.....	5919.....	59
Castlerea.....	4560.....	50
Westport.....	3056.....	49
Claremorris.....	3411.....	50
Castlebar.....	2173.....	41

"Year after year they leave their homes, their families and their friends, and go far away, among strangers, to gather with bitter toil the money for the winter's food. And the returning season always finds them back, clinging doggedly to the barren soil. The man on the station platform was right.

"'God be good to them, they love the land.'"

NOTE XXI

(From page 115, Vol. II.)

LETTER OF JOHN MITCHELL FROM THE UNPUBLISHED CORRESPONDENCE OF COL. JOHN O'MAHONEY

"RICHMOND, VA.: 28 Jan'y: 1867.

"MR. M. MOYNAHAN¹:

"Since I saw you in New York every new incident that has befallen only confirms me in the opinion which was then settled in my mind—that Stephens has been deluding you all.

"I have not been willing to state so publicly, lest I should discourage one honest fellow-countryman here from sustaining him in case he should, after all, mean what he said.

"I now believe less than ever in the existence of any formidable organization, either in Ireland or in England; and I am more than ever convinced, that while England is at peace with America or France, all invasions and insurrections will be in vain. It is not that I stand out for 'civilized' warfare. The Irish have the clear right to strike at England anywhere, or anyhow, in Canada, in Ireland, in London, by steel or gunpowder or firewood. But I hold that those who undertake any such warfare at present, whether civilized or uncivilized, must perish and perish in vain.

"With these views you must see that I could not join in any new appeal for money for war-material, nor any new representations of the near approach of an insurrection or invasion.

"If the Fenian organization here could be kept together, merely as a permanent association of Irishmen, to wait patiently for an opportunity (which must arise, and may soon) and would not

¹ When Col. O'Mahoney was connected with the *Irish People* newspaper, New York, Mr. Moynahan was his secretary and was evidently the intermediary.

demand money save the trifle needful merely to keep the organization active and in connexion with a central executive—then I think good would come of it. But our people are so nervously impatient for immediate results, and so easily excited and deluded by people who promise tremendous achievements, that I suppose they would never be satisfied with such a tame waiting organization.

“I assure you, my dear sir, that I feel bitterly the position in which Stephens has left yourself and O’Leary, and other good Irishmen, to say nothing of those—the best of all—who are now suffering their doom in many a prison.

“Yours truly,

“JOHN MITCHELL.”

NOTE XXII

(From page 132, Vol. II.)

TYRANNY PRACTISED UPON THE TENANTS OF IRISH ESTATES

Mr. Butt details an example in a foot-note as follows: “Very few persons are aware of the extent to which restrictions of this nature are enforced on Irish estates. These restrictions are as old as the institution of the Poor Law. Perhaps the most remarkable instance of their cruel operation is to be found in an occurrence which as long back as the year 1851, was brought before the readers of *The Times*. On the estate of the Marquis of Lansdowne, in Kerry, an order of this nature had been issued. I will not attempt to weaken the effect of the narrative by any paraphrase:

“‘On the estate of the Marquis of Lansdowne there lived a few months ago, a man and his wife, Michael and Judith Donoghue; they lived in the house of one Casey. An order had gone forth on the estate (a common order in Ireland) that no tenant is to admit any lodger into his house. This was a general order. It appears, however, that at the same time special orders are given having regard to particular individuals. The Donoghues had a nephew, one Denis Shea. This boy had no father living. He

had lived with his grandmother, who had been turned out of their holding for harbouring him. Denis Shea was twelve years old—a child of decidedly dishonest habits. Orders were given by the driver of this estate that this child should not be harboured upon it. This young Cain, thus branded and prosecuted, being a thief, he had stolen a shilling, a hen and done many other such crimes as a neglected twelve-year-old famished child will do—wandering about. One night he came to his Aunt Donoghue, who lodged with Casey. He had the hen with him.

“‘Casey told his lodgers not to “allow him in the house” as the agent’s driver had given orders about it. The woman, the child’s aunt, took up a pike, or pitchfork and struck him down with it; the child was crying at the time. The man Donoghue, his uncle, with a cord tied the child’s hands behind his back. The poor child after a while crawls or staggers to the door of one Sullivan and tries to get in there. The maid of Sullivan called to Donoghue to take him away. This he did: but he afterwards returned with his hands still tied behind his back. Donoghue had already beaten him severely. The child seeks refuge in other cabins, but is pursued by his character—he was so bad a boy, the fear of the agent and the driver—all were forbidden to shelter him. He is brought back by some neighbours in the night, to Casey’s, where his uncle and aunt lived. The said neighbours tried to force the sinking child in upon his relatives. There is a struggle at the door. The child was heard asking some one to put him upright. In the morning there is blood upon the threshold. The child is stiff dead—a corpse, with his arms tied; around it every mark of a last fearful struggle for shelter—food—the common rights of humanity. The Donoghues were tried at the late Kerry assizes. It was morally a clear case of murder; but it was said or believed that these Donoghues acted not in malice to the child, but under a sort of sense of self-preservation; that they felt to admit him was to become wanderers themselves. They were indicted for manslaughter and found guilty.

“‘Those who know the superstitions of charity with which the Irish people entertain strangers, the warm and tender affection with which they cherish the feelings of kindred, will understand the terrible coercion under which this poor boy was driven from the door.’”

NOTE XXIII

(From page 271, Vol. I.)

HISTORY OF THE INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN DUBLIN TO ASCERTAIN
POSITIVELY THE BURIAL PLACE OF ROBERT EMMET

At the close of the eighteenth century the Emmet family of Dublin, Ireland, resided on West Stephen's Green and Lamb Lane near the corner of York Street. The church of that parish was St. Peter's, fronting on Anugier Street. According to a map used by "The Wide Street Commission," between 1790 and 1800, the shape of the land plot of the churchyard may be described as an oblique truncated parallelogram. Anugier Street, on the east side, ran north and south. Its north boundary line formed a right angle and extended to St. Peter's Row or White Friars Street on the west, which latter thoroughfare, running from northwest to southeast, shortened the length of the south boundary line greatly in comparison with that of the north wall with which it was parallel. St. Peter's Church at that time occupied the middle third of the ground plot, in the form of a parallelogram, from east to west, with the addition of an incomplete transept extending nearly to the north boundary wall. Subsequent to 1860 a similar addition was made to the south side of the church to complete the cross. At one period, along the outside of the south wall of the churchyard ran Church Alley, from Anugier to White Friars Street. This is now built over. In the southeast corner of the churchyard, at the angle of Anugier Street and Church Alley, extending back upon the church property for twenty-two feet stood a watch- or guardhouse. This building was used before the beginning of the last century and was removed about 1830.

The Emmet burial-place, or family vault, was situated in this churchyard but no map is known to be in existence by which the exact spot can be ascertained. The only indication is given by Dr. Richard R. Madden in his work, *The Lives of the United Irishmen*, in the second edition of which, published just previous to 1860, he records the death and burial of Doctor Robert Emmet as follows:

"Dr. Emmet died at Casino, near Milltown (outside of Dublin), in the autumn of 1802. He was buried in the graveyard of St. Peter's Church, in Anugier Street, on the right-hand side of the entrance, close to the wall on the south side."

He also states that the tomb or vault had the following inscription on it:

" HERE LIES THE REMAINS OF
ROBERT EMMET, ESQR., M.D.,
WHO DIED THE 9TH OF DECEMBER, 1802,
IN THE 73D YEAR OF HIS AGE."

Mr. Fitzpatrick, in his *Sham Squire*, is the only other authority on the location of this burial-place. He simply states that it was situated in the southeast corner of the churchyard.

In 1880 the writer failed not only to find this tomb but any other in St. Peter's churchyard. He found, on inquiry, that all the tombstones had been removed some years before, but were yet preserved, and that several feet of earth had been spread upon the surface of the ground to raise it to the level of the street in front. The tombstones, after removal and after the filling in of the yard, had been placed in piles along the west boundary wall. These were carefully examined at the time of the writer's visit but no trace of any bearing the name of Emmet was found. As the inscribed stone found by Dr. Madden marking the Emmet vault or tomb was a flat one, lying horizontally over the entrance, it was inferred by the writer then that this was not removed with the others but was merely covered over when the ground was filled in to the level of Anugier Street and back to White Friars Street.

The tombstones examined in 1880 are now secured upright against the walls of the church and yard and one of them is laid in the floor of the recently built portion of the transept on the south side as though to mark a vault or grave covered by that portion of the church; but, in the absence of any map or plan among the church records which might have been used as a guide to the removal and placing of the tombstones in their subsequent position, we must infer that the latter was decided at haphazard and with complete indifference to the rights of the living and the dead.

On the approach of the centenary of the death of Robert Emmet the writer was urged, through letters received from widely separated parts of the world, to initiate as a representative of the Emmet family an effort to discover the place of his ancestor's burial. Before placing on record what has been accomplished in furtherance of this object it is necessary to place before the reader, in detail, some circumstantial evidence which has for a longer or shorter period been known and more or less accepted by the present generation of the family in regard to the manner and place of Robert Emmet's burial. Everything relating to the life and death of his granduncle possessed for the writer intense interest, from his earliest childhood and throughout a period when he was in full and frequent communication with his father, his grandmother, his uncles and aunts who had known personally their kinsman, Robert Emmet, and who must have been familiar with all the circumstances of his death and burial. Although the writer cannot remember ever hearing the subject of Robert Emmet's burial discussed by any contemporary member of the family the impression received at that period, and long maintained by the writer, was that his ancestor had been buried in an uninscribed grave as was his well-known wish. No doubt was ever cast, so far as the writer knows, upon this assumption until all those who had knowledge of the subject had passed away. The existence of the family burial-place in St. Peter's churchyard was known to every member of the family before the publication of Dr. Madden's work and it was equally well known that several of the younger children as well as Christopher Temple Emmet, the eldest son, were interred there before the death of their father, Doctor Robert Emmet; that the body of the mother of Robert was placed there but a few days before his execution and that his sister, Mrs. Robert Holmes, dying a year later was also buried with her parents. It must also have been known later to the children of Thomas Addis Emmet that at the time of their uncle's execution every male member of his family, near relative or connection was dead, in exile or imprisoned, so that in consequence of this and of the disturbed state of Ireland it was impossible to place his body then in the family vault. But after the release from prison of Robert Emmet's brother-in-law, Mr. Robert Holmes, and of his maternal uncle, Mr. John Patten, the

latter must have learned from the Reverend Thomas Gamble, a connection of the family and Assistant Curate of St. Michan's Church, of his disposition of the body of Robert after he had removed it from the gate-house of Potter's Field, Dublin, on the night after the execution. It cannot be supposed that these two gentlemen, who were men of great prominence and lived for over fifty years in Dublin after that event, remained ignorant of the disposition of their relative's body. Nor is it possible that, had there been any doubt in the minds of his relatives in New York that Robert's body had not been finally placed at rest with his father and mother, the fact would not at least have been discussed; for even before the death of Thomas Addis Emmet no reason for secrecy any longer existed. All the facts must have been known to at least ten members of the family, the last of whom did not die until the writer had passed middle life.

No one now living knows when the body of Robert Emmet was removed from the receiving vault of St. Michan's Church where it is believed to have been placed by Mr. Gamble. But it is known that Robert's sister, Mrs. Holmes, was interred in the family vault in St. Peter's about a year after his death; and for some unexplained reason this interment took place at a late hour in the night. Why could it not have taken place, as was the usual custom, publicly and in daylight? It is a not unnatural inference, in the absence of any other known reason or plausible theory for so unusual a procedure, that the same hour and place were chosen for the removal also of her brother's body and its final interment in the family tomb. The lateness of the hour and the darkness, combined with the necessary opening of the vault, would have made the transference of Robert Emmet's body and its burial feasible with secrecy and the avoidance of public disturbance.

It was only at the time of the writer's last visit to his old friend, Dr. Madden in Dublin in the summer of 1880 that he was impressed with the possibility that Robert Emmet's body lay in the Protestant Cemetery of Glasneven. He yielded to Dr. Madden's opinion in this because of the latter's thorough and extended study and investigation of the subject. Elsewhere¹ this visit and Dr. Madden's opinions and information on the subject have been

¹ *The Emmet Family*, etc.

given in full. Since Dr. Madden's death the writer has realized the fact from many circumstances not plain at that time that the former had, even at the time of his visit, reached an extreme old age when, as he has since learned, his mental faculties had become greatly impaired. At that time he gave the writer several letters which proved that he had forgotten other circumstances and had wandered away from facts which in earlier life he had accepted as proven. One of the letters in question, written many years before, was from the Reverend Patrick Carroll, rector of the parish church of Glasneven, in answer to an inquiry of Dr. Madden. Mr. Carroll therein stated that in his efforts to clear up the churchyard, on taking over the parish, he had set upright a number of headstones which had fallen and encumbered the walks and that he recollected personally placing the stone, which is now popularly supposed to cover the grave of Robert Emmet, in its present position in order to get it out of the way; that he had had it moved from some distance and from the other side of the churchyard. Dr. Carroll's statement may be taken for what it is worth.

In St. Michan's churchyard, on the left-hand side going from the church down the central pathway, there is an uninscribed, flat tombstone which has for many years been regarded as covering Robert Emmet's grave. For some years past this grave has been cared for and protected from desecration by Mr. J. F. Fuller, of Dublin, who is a distant connection of the family of Robert Emmet's mother.

At the beginning of the investigations about to be described, no one doubted that full proof would be found in one of the three situations designated of the actual place of his burial.

Chiefly upon the representations of Francis J. Biggar, Esq., of Belfast, and the recently published work of David A. Quaid, Esq., on Robert Emmet, the writer took the first steps in these investigations. These gentlemen kindly undertook to obtain the necessary permits and particularly through the efforts of Mr. Quaid, who was a resident of Dublin, all arrangements were perfected by July 4th of this year. At an early hour on Monday, July 6, 1903, in the presence of Messrs. Biggar, Quaid, Fuller, the Rev. Stanford F. H. Robinson, Assistant Curate, Robert Emmet, a son of the writer, and the writer himself, a wide trench

was dug towards the west along the south wall of St. Peter's churchyard. This excavation was extended from the foundations of the old guard-house for twenty-eight feet beyond the supposed site of the Emmet vault on the southeast part of the yard. In this distance a vault was uncovered eight feet long by eight and a half feet wide, with the tops of two brick graves which were unopened. As far as the excavation extended, along the south wall of the enclosure and in line with the east wall of the new portion of the transept and almost to the south wall of the church, a concrete surface was exposed about eight inches in thickness. This seemed to have been spread over the original surface of the yard, after the headstones and footstones had been removed, and upon it the earth had been filled in increasing in depth towards the west. The top of the vault found was ten feet west of the foundations of the guard-house, projected above the concrete and was near the present surface of the ground. This vault, which occupied the supposed situation of the Emmet vault, was opened at both ends after the removal of the concrete and earth which covered the remains of a flight of stone steps. The vault contained four coffins in a fair state of preservation. On two of these were coffin plates bearing different names and, from the dates inscribed, it is probable that they were the last buried before the prohibitive law went into operation. It was probably the receiving vault of the church. Nothing in connection with the Emmet family was found throughout a careful search of five days, during which an excavation was also made along the south wall of the church to the right of the entrance on that side. At different points openings were made in the concrete surface and the ground in every direction probed and sounded by means of an iron crowbar to the depth of several feet. It was demonstrated by these means that only the single vault found existed in that portion of the churchyard. In no instance were the remains in any grave disturbed or even approached with the crowbar within four or five feet. Throughout these operations one or more of the gentlemen mentioned above was always present to superintend the work.

So far nothing had been discovered to show that Robert Emmet was not finally buried in the family vault in this churchyard but, if Dr. Madden's description of the locality of the vault in its

relation to the present entrance of the church is correct and if Fitzpatrick's statement is true that it was located in the south-east corner of the churchyard, or more properly in that relation to the guard-house which formerly occupied that situation, the fact is now clearly established that the Emmet vault and others if they existed in that neighborhood have at some later period been demolished and filled in. The only other hypothesis is that both Dr. Madden and Fitzpatrick were wrong in regard to the locality they both ascribed to it. What disposition was made of the large, flat, inscribed stone which marked its site and covered the opening to the vault in Madden's time? If it had been left *in situ* and the top of the vault covered over, this stone would have been found above the concrete; if it had been left on the surface of the ground, it would have been found beneath the concrete. We must therefore either assume that it was deliberately destroyed or removed and deposited elsewhere. In this connection the fact is noteworthy that it is not to be found among the hundreds of others already referred to, which are carefully preserved even to the pieces which in many cases have been broken off.

The present church has a large entrance at the back or west side, which, according to the recent testimony of a number of persons did not exist in the old church. Before the present church was altered, White Friars Street, on the west side, was much above the level of the churchyard. Therefore, the present main entrance to the church would have been very awkwardly placed and, if it existed, could only have been reached by a series of steps. It is an interesting circumstance that, if we assume that Dr. Madden had reference in his description to an entrance then existing on the west side, it is in reality the only spot whose locality would be termed "along the south wall" of both the enclosure and of the church. At the same time it would also be to the right both of an entrance *from* the street and *to* the church. Therefore, it was still possible that the Emmet vault was located in the southwest portion of the enclosure, along the south wall of the churchyard and also of the church.

At this point in the investigations, further search in St. Peter's churchyard was suspended until the necessary permission to extend the excavation along the whole south wall of both the church

and enclosure could be obtained from the authorities. The extreme degree of courtesy already shown by the church authorities throughout the investigation makes the hope that this will be granted a plausible one.

In the meanwhile, to save time and avoid possible future delay, the uninscribed grave in St. Michan's churchyard, already referred to, was opened on August 1st in the presence of Messrs. Quaid, Fuller, Lambert H. Ormsby, President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, of 92 Merrion Square, Dublin, and Alexander Frazer, Professor of Anatomy, of 18 Northbrook Street, Dublin.

In this grave the remains of two bodies were found. First, that of a girl of about thirteen years; below, at the depth of six feet, that of a man which, after a careful examination of his skull and jaw-bones had been made by the surgeons present, was pronounced by them to have been at least seventy years of age at the time of his death. The cervical vertebræ also were perfect—a crucial test in regard to the body of Robert Emmet—and the length and size of the thigh-bone proved him to have been a very tall and powerful man. Robert Emmet was neither. After a thorough examination the bones were replaced and the grave filled in.

This discovery proves, beyond peradventure, that Robert Emmet was not buried in this grave which has for so long a time been popularly ascribed to him.

It is regrettable that, at the moment at which this volume goes to press, the investigations have not been carried beyond the point described above. At the time of this writing, therefore, part of St. Peter's churchyard has been thoroughly explored, with negative results; the uninscribed tomb in St. Michan's has been thoroughly explored, with positive results—Robert Emmet *was not* buried there. There still remains, in the sifting of *all* the evidence left us by tradition, a thorough search for the Emmet family vault in the remaining unexamined portion of St. Peter's churchyard and, this proving vain, the uninscribed grave in the Protestant churchyard of Glasneven.

DIARY OF
THOS. ADDIS EMMET,

While Acting in Paris as the Secret Agent of the
UNITED IRISHMEN,

From May 30, 1803, to March 10, 1804.

Taken from *The Emmet Family, with some Incidents Relating to
Irish History, etc.*

THOS. ADDIS EMMET

SECRET AGENT OF THE UNITED IRISHMEN

RESIDENCE OF THOS. A. EMMET ON THE CONTINENT—HIS RELATIONS WITH ARTHUR O'CONNOR—DIARY OF HIS POLITICAL ACTION WHILE IN PARIS, AS THE AGENT OF THE IRISH LEADERS, TO ESTABLISH A REPUBLIC IN IRELAND

THOS. ADDIS EMMET was living in Brussels and making his arrangements to emigrate with his family to the United States when he received a communication by a special messenger from the Directory of the United Irishmen urging him to proceed to Paris and act there as the Minister from the Irish Republic. At that time it was assumed probable that the Republic would be established with the aid of France. This changed his plans and he accepted the position of Minister, with the hope of eventually being able to return with his family to his native country.

During his residence in Paris Mr. Emmet kept a full diary of all matters pertaining to Irish affairs, and this diary gives a full insight into a part of Irish history which in the past has been very obscure. This diary has been but recently discovered in a packet of old family papers. After the Irish movement had failed and Mr. Emmet had emigrated to America, he evidently wished the whole matter to pass into oblivion. This is more than probable, for had his sons had any knowledge of this record, it would undoubtedly have been sent, as were all the other papers, to Dr. Madden when he was preparing his memoir of their father. It will be seen from this journal that no man exercised a greater influence to the detriment of the national cause than Arthur O'Connor, through his intrigues and constant interference. Mr. Emmet had a profound feeling of mistrust for Mr. O'Connor's political honesty and this was heightened by the unaccountable

fact that Mr. O'Connor was never subjected to the close confinement imposed upon the other State prisoners on their first arrival at Fort George. Both Mr. O'Connor and his wife were allowed to come and go without restraint, as if they were most loyal to the Government; and it has been an unexplained circumstance that his wife and children were allowed to join him immediately after he reached Fort George. In every other instance the Government not only refused permission for the wife of a prisoner to reside in the neighborhood of the fortress but no one was allowed to have even a personal interview, as by order of the Government the only communication permitted was a written one, limited in length, and the delivery was left entirely with the discretion of the commanding officer. In Dr. Madden's sketch of Samuel Neilson's life (one of the leaders of the United Irishmen and also confined at Fort George) is given a letter written March 30, 1800, to his wife, in which he writes: "Mrs. O'Connor and her children remain with Mr. O'Connor, and they have all the liberty of *ranging the Fort and neighbourhood*¹; the other nineteen of us are closely confined as usual." In a letter of May 18, 1800, Mr. Neilson again wrote to his wife: "Mrs. O'Connor and her family are still here, but Mrs. Emmet has hitherto failed in all her applications; there appears to be a MARKED difference." We may infer from another letter written to Mrs. Neilson on November 4, 1801, that her husband did not trust Mr. O'Connor: "*A certain gentleman has ceased to have mischief in his power here.*" Hudson, Chambers, Tennent, and Dowling alone are on speaking terms with him." That this statement refers to Mr. O'Connor cannot be doubted by any one familiar with the circumstances. The utmost good-will and harmony unbroken existed among the other prisoners and the only discordant element was associated with Arthur and Roger O'Connor. The latter, however, seemed to have been on equally good terms with the Government, as a short time after the beginning of his stay at Fort George he was allowed to go to London, and was then released on the score of bad health—a degree of consideration which has never been shown at any other time to an Irish political prisoner who was not "friendly" to the Government. The then British Government was most desirous of obtaining some "legal" evidence

¹ The italics were made by Mr. Neilson.

against Mr. Emmet and it is not improbable that he discovered some indication showing that Mr. O'Connor had been sent to Fort George for that purpose.

It is evident that Mr. Emmet had good reason to believe that Mr. Arthur O'Connor had "made his peace" with the Government after his arrest and that he was sent to Fort George to act as a spy; and Dr. McNeven held the same opinion. Mr. Emmet and Mr. O'Connor were not in the Irish Directory at the same time and had no personal acquaintance until after they were imprisoned in Dublin. All who knew Mr. Emmet as a friend agree that he was a cool, quiet, even-tempered man, who kept his feelings in full subjection by a very judicial and well-balanced mind. This feeling of mistrust regarding Mr. O'Connor impressed him so deeply that it could never have arisen entirely from any personal grievance against Mr. O'Connor. Moreover, Mr. Emmet would never have allowed any feeling of a personal nature to conflict with such service as Mr. O'Connor could have rendered the Irish cause, had he deemed him trustworthy. Mr. Emmet, furthermore, states in his diary that his complaint against Mr. O'Connor could not be disclosed until he could lay it before the Irish Government. Mr. St. John Mason, a cousin of Mr. T. A. Emmet, visited him at Fort George in 1800. He was not, however, allowed to see the prisoner and could only communicate with him by letter. Mr. Mason in one of his letters made reference to rendering some service to Mr. Arthur O'Connor. Mr. Emmet answered, as Mr. Mason stated, that he had "public and private, personal and political reasons for not having anything to do with, or to put himself in the way of owing any personal obligation to either of the Messrs. O'Connor."

After their release from prison, Mr. Emmet and Mr. O'Connor at once made their arrangements to fight a duel, which had been for some time pending. Before their landing in Holland, however, their fellow-prisoners exerted sufficient influence on both to induce them to abandon the duel and to avoid a public scandal. Dr. Madden gives a full account of the whole affair and states clearly that Mr. O'Connor at that time expressed approbation of Mr. Emmet's moral and political course. Under the circumstances Mr. O'Connor was not justified in his attack on Mr. Emmet's memory as late as 1848 when, in a work called *Monopoly*,

the Root of all Evil, he charges Mr. Emmet with being "a coward, and a man of bad faith." Every act of Mr. Emmet's public and private life goes to disprove both charges. Mr. O'Connor certainly never had the courage, during Mr. Emmet's lifetime, to make the charge or even to hint at it; and he certainly did not strengthen the possibility of its truthfulness by making a dastardly attack so many years after Mr. Emmet's death.

Dr. Madden, who investigated this matter thoroughly, who based his account of the whole affair on the testimony of those personally known to him and who acted for both Mr. Emmet and Mr. O'Connor, who, moreover, published, in his life of Mr. Emmet, the statements of these witnesses, concludes his consideration of the subject as follows:

"It is unnecessary for me to trouble the reader with any comments on the preceding statements. I will only observe that the several statements may be relied on as an exact account of the occurrences that came to the knowledge of the persons by whom they were made—men of high character, honour, and integrity; and that it is impossible to read these statements without feeling there is evidence in them of solid worth—of unswerving principles—of honour, truth, and sterling honesty—on the part of T. A. Emmet."

The fact is clear that after Mr. O'Connor's supposed arrest, for some reason now unknown he lost the confidence of all the Irish leaders. He was entirely ignored by them while in Paris and though the movement was going on in Ireland, with the expectation of help from France, Mr. O'Connor was not trusted with any information with regard to it while Mr. Emmet was in constant communication with the other leaders and the centres of the revolution.

Moreover, Mr. Emmet had the full confidence of "Honest John Sweetman," Dr. McNeven and of all the Irishmen in Paris who at that time could lay any claim to leadership. It is true that Napoleon and his ministers treated Mr. O'Connor with the greatest consideration while Mr. Emmet received but scant courtesy. This is a matter which was difficult to understand at the time but with our present knowledge it is now evident that Napoleon, having determined on a course of lying and treachery to the Irish people, made every effort to spread dissension among them and

used Mr. O'Connor's vanity for that purpose afterwards. As Mr. O'Connor failed in being able to render England any service he received no further reward and was not allowed to return to Ireland but on one occasion, for a few weeks, towards the close of his life when he had been forgotten.

His Political Diary in Paris

“On Monday, 30th of May, 1803, Col. Dalton, a French officer of Irish parentage, who had previously cultivated my acquaintance, as I plainly saw, from political motives, called on me at Corneil, and after a little preliminary conversation, told me he came *officially* charged by the Minister at War to inform me that the French Government were determined on sending an expedition to Ireland. That Gen. Massena was appointed to the command; that it would be more worthy of the French Nation, and such as would bear no room for contest, even if the Irish were not at first prepared to act in its support. At the same time the French were sensible of the impossibility of conquering Ireland, and their wishes, as well as their interests, only went to making it separate from England; that Ireland should be left at liberty to choose its own form of government.

“He requested me to communicate this intelligence to my friends in Ireland, in such a way as I might think fit; at the same time to inform them that the expedition could not be ready before six months, and even if any hostile movements took place on the continent it would be necessary to end them first; but that the French Government by no means wished the Irish to commit themselves by any previous movements, as the force would be sufficient to beat the English, even if the Irish did not stir. I asked what would be the force, and he answered he believed about twenty-five thousand men; at any rate the name of the General was sufficient assurance that he would not go with an insignificant force. I replied to all this, that as the communication he had made was undoubtedly of the first importance to my country I would communicate it, as I would have done if I had received the same information in any other way, and my future conduct with the French government should be guided by the instructions I should receive from home; that for the present,

however, I should observe that the People of Ireland felt so much disgusted with the treatment they had already received, in being buoyed up with false hopes and promises which had been broken, they had learned so entirely to distrust, in consequence of the repeated messages they had received, and their final abandonment at the peace, that they would probably withdraw their confidence from me and consider me an additional dupe to the schemes and intrigues of France, if I gave them assurances of a large force being sent, when the deficiency of means for performing such a promise presented itself to every mind; that besides, I ought not to dissemble. France had lost the confidence of Ireland, and the treatment which the Irish had received in France ever since the peace, almost proscribed, and those whose fortunes had been ruined by attachment to France suffered to languish in poverty; that such treatment had excited even an aversion, and would render a great many steps on the part of France necessary besides an expedition, if confidence was to be restored between the two countries; that it was not even clear to me how an expedition, unprecedented by such steps, would be received; that Ireland ever since the peace was forced to look only upon her own internal resources, and she had acquired a conviction that her independence was certain, tho' perhaps by slower degrees, from the progressive ruin of England and her own increasing strength; and that this mode of acquiring liberty would be unincumbered with treaties of alliance or commerce, and unattended by the introduction of foreign troops. As it might, however, be slow, I readily avowed my own opinion that if the event could be more speedily brought about by a French expedition, so conducted as not to interfere with the rights of the country, much would be gained. But in order to restore confidence on the part of the Irish to France, many measures should be adopted, into the details of which I hoped I should have an opportunity of entering at another time. Mr. Dalton answered me that I certainly should, and that Gen^l Massena and the Minister of War would be very happy to see me; that the French Government wished to conciliate the Irish, and succour such as might want it. That he therefore wished to know whether there were a sufficient number of Irish here to form a legion. I answered, I would inquire; that at present I believed not; such as were here might be easily

placed; he answered, certainly. He said, as to the means of the French, they had vessels of the line and a number of frigates in or within reach of Brest; that others were shortly expected; that Spain and Holland would certainly be drawn into the war, and that for so short a time troops might be crowded; that he himself had sailed five times out of Brest, tho' watched by the English, and the same could at any time be easily done. As Col. D. staid all night with me, we often returned to the same subject, in the course of which I suggested the propriety and justice of paying the arrears of pensions to the Irish that had been discontinued since the peace, and I asked the means of sending a message to Ireland, which he assured me should be had. Knowing that he had been also cultivating Mr. A. O'Connor, I took the opportunity of asking him if he had communicated this message from the French Government to any one but me. He answered that he had, to Mr. O'Connor only; that the Government knew we were not friends, but it trusted we would both serve our country to the utmost. I answered, Government was free to choose to whom it would make known its secrets, and that I trusted we would each serve Ireland according to our ability and knowledge.

"I then asked if the office of Foreign Affairs had any knowledge of what he had mentioned; he assured me not, and would not; that in truth it did not lye within that department, and was only known to the Minister at War and Gen^l Massena. At this I expressed my satisfaction and hoped I should have no intercourse with that office, as during the last war everything that was transacted with it by the Irish was quietly known to the English Government. The next morning, before his departure, he again spoke to me about Mr. O'Connor, as if the French Government wished to reconcile us, at least so far as that we might act together. To this I answered that I doubted not but we would both do our best for Ireland; that, however, whatever good we did must be by separate efforts. On which he dropt the subject, and he appointed next morning, Wednesday, June 1st, for me to call upon him, that he might fix a time for my seeing Massena. On his return home he lamented to Mrs. Tone O'C's difference & mine, and said he saw it would come to this, that Government would act with both as long as it could, and at last would be obliged to choose between us.

“In the evening of Tuesday, May 31st, I went to Paris and there saw Gallagher, who brought me accounts from Ireland, which he was charged to communicate to none but me, leaving me the discretion of mentioning them where I thought fit. The purport of these accounts was that an organization on a new and closer plan had been carried to a great extent among the U. I.; that a communication between North and South had been thoroughly established; that very proper and respectable men had come forward, particularly in the North, where it was least expected; that a communication had also been opened with Scotland, from which their co-operation was expected; that the counties of Kildare, Wicklow, and some others near Dublin, as well as Dublin, were in a very forward state; that they had considerable depôts in Dublin; for instance, in one depôt twenty-five hundred pikes ready handled and one thousand with the handles ready; that finding their strength increasing they had not been forward to begin, but were determined in case an attack should be made on any of their depôts to commence, that these were so circumstanced as to be able to resist a battalion if it came to attack them, long enough to let the county of Wicklow come in; that Dwyer had pledged himself to come in and to bring that county with him if any depôt was attacked, which was to be the signal for beginning; that independent of his party there were members from the neighbouring counties in town only waiting to defend the depôts if attacked; that delegates from the people had been spoken to, who wished to know when they would be called out. They were answered that no time would be fixed, that they would have timely notice, and when once called upon they should not be put back; with this they were content. That at present Government did not seem to have the slightest suspicion, but as things could not be kept long in that state, I was ordered to apply to the First Consul and to endeavour to procure money, arms, ammunition, and officers, to be landed in places that were designated to me; that if that was complied with a person would be sent to give previous notice of their coming, and that on their arrival the people should begin. If that could not be obtained I was desired to try and raise money from any rich countrymen or any Americans that might favour the cause, as [the want of] money was the principal difficulty, it being impos-

sible to attempt subscriptions at home without discovery. I was further desired to send home McP., McD., and S., particularly McD., because the communication was worse established with his county than elsewhere. In the communication with Scotland one thing very deserving of notice had occurred. One delegate was admitted to meet five from the Scotch; he supposed [they were the] Executive Committee; they asked him precisely whether Ireland continued attached to France; he answered that Ireland was very much disgusted with France, and would not take her assistance if she could do without it; but that if it became necessary the Irish would take what was wanting for securing her independence and no more. The Scotch answered they were very glad Ireland was disgusted with France, as they were themselves, and would have nothing to do with her; that they would gladly assist Ireland provided she did not connect herself with France farther than was absolutely necessary, and that if on matters breaking out in Ireland they were not ready to rise they would at least keep up such an alarm in their own country as would prevent the withdrawing of troops.

“After weighing this intelligence well and considering the communication which had been made the day before by Dalton—after considering the influence of that from home and the difficulty, if not the impossibility of fulfilling the promises made by France, that if Ireland was as represented it could scarcely hope to remain quiet for the protracted and probably uncertain period they marked out, and that if it was again subdued for want of foreign succour, Massena and his army would probably arrive too late; that besides they were plunderers, disliked and detested not only by many of the United Irishmen, but also by the Scotch, and in such numbers would perhaps attempt to give the law, which was not what was asked for by the United Irishmen; after balancing all these things the whole night I determined to solicit an interview with the Chief Consul and after informing him of the information I had received, tell him I was going to make his offer known to those who were acting in Ireland, and to beg to know whether if they persisted in asking for a small and immediate force, after being made acquainted with his intentions, they might count upon its being given. To point out to him that whatever risque this might be to Ireland, it was a manifest gain to France, if she could separate

Ireland without endangering the remnant of her marine, and before England had been enabled to prey on her commerce, and that when Ireland made the same request before, if it had been granted, in May, 1798, success would have been infallible, and England at this day incapable of insulting or attempting to tyrannize over any other country. As I clearly saw that the interests of Massena and the Minister of War were connected with a large expedition and a formidable army, and that the prejudices of most Frenchmen would tend the same way, I determined to hold no communication with them on the subject, but speak only to the Chief Consul himself, who had not the same personal interests, but who in fact had none but those of France, to subdue England as speedily and cheaply and with as little risque to the marine as possible; besides, I was determined to make him the only depository of my country's secret, because when that was done and was known to be the case, I conceived I did the utmost to avoid the betraying of my secret to the enemy.

“Accordingly, on Wednesday, June 1st, at the appointed hour, I waited on Col. Dalton, and after some general conversation I asked him whether the Chief Consul knew of the communication he had done me the honour of making to me. At this unexpected question he seemed staggered a good deal, and after some hesitation answered that he received his instructions from the Minister of War and Genl Massena. I then replied that my reason for asking the question was that since I had seen him last I had received very important communications from Ireland, which I was charged to communicate only to the First Consul; that in consideration of the persons who had done me the honour of making known to me the intentions of the French Government, I might perhaps have relaxed from a strict obedience to those orders if I did not see that the nature and importance of what I had to say fully satisfied my asking such a favour and obliged me to declare that I could communicate them only to him, or some one expressly authorized by him to receive them; that before I obtained such an interview it was right to apprise Government who I was and by what right I acted. They probably knew that before my arrest in Ireland I had been of the Executive Committee of the United Irishmen, and they also knew of my confinement since; that in addition to that I was appointed by those at present acting

in Ireland their agent to the French Republic, and as such exclusively held the thread of communication with the existing organization. That what I wished to state to the First Consul was only known to myself and I was resolved it should be known only to him by my means. That I had credentials of my appointment, and could get them further verified if I called together my countrymen in Paris, but that such a means would cause so much publicity as would render secrecy impossible. That I therefore chose to dispense with it and content myself with pledging my word of honour and my future responsibility on the truth of my assertion. That under these circumstances I begged leave earnestly to solicit an interview with the First Consul as soon as possible.

“Mr. Dalton said he was afraid there would be difficulties; that negotiations were still going on, and the preparations were even a little relaxed.

“I asked was England to be the only nation that had permission at the same time to make war and carry on negotiations.—‘She is taking your ships, and will you not make war on her?’ He said we are making war. ‘Then, if so, what objection can there be to hearing from me things that may assist you in carrying it on? At the same time, if I thought peace could issue from those negotiations, I would deny myself the honour I solicit; and if the Chief Consul thinks they can end in peace, I beg he may refuse me; but if his objections arise only from prudence, he is master of time and circumstances so as to secure perfect secrecy, and I shall conform myself to his wishes.’ In the course of this conversation one or two expressions escaped from him worthy of note. Speaking of Mr. O’Connor and me, he said he hoped there would be no factions in Ireland, as if there were two factions the French army would be obliged to erect itself into a third to put them down; and on some other occasion connected with the same subject, he said,—‘I told you on my honour, as I had been commissioned, that the People of Ireland would be at perfect liberty to choose its own form of government, but it is natural to suppose that it would be wished it might assume the form of the Protecting Government.’ These two last observations I received without comment,—but concluded with requesting the desired interview, and he appointed Friday, June 3rd, for my receiving an answer.

“ Before I called on Col. Dalton I had learned that Gen^l Harty,¹ an Irishman by birth and a cousin to Dalton, wished to see me on the same subject. I mentioned his name to D., and my wish to know him, but found rather a coldness to bringing us together; from which I conjectured there was some kind of jealousy which would take the lead. In the evening, however, I saw the general, and he held with me the same kind of conversation Dalton had done the Monday before. As I wished for secrecy, I said nothing for the present of my desire of seeing Bonaparte, but took the opportunity of informing him that I was the appointed agent for the United Irishmen. I also learned to-day that Mr. O'Connor is beginning to assume the man of consequence; in conversing with Fitzhenry he talked a good deal of the difficulty of being a diplomatic character. He also said he would not allow the French to go to Ireland unless bound by very strict conditions, which he afterwards explained, their being put under the absolute command of one person, which he gave to understand would be *himself*. I understand too that in conversation with T. Cobbett he expressed his intention of acting as Ambassador from the United Irishmen, by virtue of an appointment which he alleges was made of him in the spring of 1798.

“ [N. B.—No such appointment was ever made, and is only a fabrication, but even if it had, of the then existing committee, two are in France, one in America, one dead, and only two in Ireland, of whom neither acts now, one being retained by permission of government, and the other would trust any human being sooner than Mr. O'Connor, so that he has no existing communication with the body, and the termination of the war and of connection with France superceded all previous appointments.]

“ Friday, June 3rd, called by appointment on Dalton, when nearly the following conversation took place:

“ D. ‘ Well, sir, Gen^l Massena will be happy to see you—’

“ E. ‘ I shall be charmed to see Gen^l Massena, but that was not the favour I asked for. My wish is to see the First Consul.’

“ D. ‘ Why, the negotiations are still going on, and affairs are not even so far advanced as when I spoke to you first.’

“ E. ‘ Give me leave to ask you, sir, if Gen^l Georges asked to see any part of the British Government, stating that he had matters

¹ This name seems to be spelled indifferently throughout Harty or Hartey.

of importance to communicate respecting France, would the state of the negotiations cause him to be refused ?'

"D. 'No, but you must be sensible, sir, you are not in the situation of Gen^l Georges.'

"E. 'I know, sir, I am not; I am acting for my country, he is acting against his; I am appointed by mine, he is only an individual; but in no other respect, sir, do I see any difference. Pray does the refusal come from the First Consul himself ?'

"D. 'No; the Minister at War did not think it right to make the application.'

"E. 'In one point of view I am better pleased, because, on further reflection, I am obliged to limit more than I did in my last conversation. I then said I could only communicate with the First Consul, *or some one expressly authorized by him*. I now say I can only communicate with the First Consul himself. In every other respect I beg to renew my demand with more urgency, and to request that my wish may be made known to him and the answer come personally from himself. To prevent misunderstanding, I must repeat that my application is not in consequence of the communication I had the honour of holding with you, but solely of my information from Ireland, and that if I had never heard from Government I should have sought for the interview, tho' not with the same facilities I now enjoy; that those who have given me the refusal have done so with blinded eyes, and that the Chief Consul will thank me for pressing my demand. If the objection for granting it results from prudence, he can command secrecy. If it would be thought incorrect to hold those communications while negotiations are going on, it seems to me in point of probity the same thing whether government communicates with me directly or indirectly, and I presume, sir, I am to consider everything you tell me as coming from government.'

"D. 'Certainly, but is your communication of such a nature as to admit of delay ?'

"E. 'I consider every delay as eminently injurious, and in this case I am the only competent judge.'

"D. 'Suppose the Chief Consul should refer you to the Minister at War, you know his confidence in him and their intimacy ?'

"E. 'If he did, I should be exceedingly grieved—I know nothing would grieve me more, because I am sensible of the respect

due to the Minister at War, and to the order of the First Consul, but I feel what is due to the interests of my country and the orders I have myself received.'

"D. 'I am glad I asked the question, to prevent mistakes. I did not feel the importance of your request as I do now. I shall endeavour to see the Minister to-day; will let you know on Sunday early.'

"He then endeavoured by some leading questions to come at the nature of my information and the sources from which I derived it, asking whether a large expedition would be necessary, but I took care to give no satisfactory answer. In the course of the conversation he mentioned one object of the French government would probably be, after having succeeded in Ireland, to make a descent from there on the west coast of England, in which I assured him the Irish would be glad to co-operate.

"*Saturday, 4th.*—I find that considerable inconvenience and some mischief may result from O'Connor's acting and mine. He has spoken to McCabe to go to Ireland, to the North, to carry a message saying emphatically and falsely,—'I got one expedition, and I don't see why I may not get another.' His object is to advise them to make no stir 'till the French come, to which they will probably agree. As they are not in the existing organization, and do not know the actual state of things, they will also gladly give him every authority they can, and thus very unpleasant consequences may arise. This must be remedied.

"*Sunday, 5th.*—Saw Dalton; he told me he had not been able to see the Minister, who had been called to St. Cloud; that he could not hope to see him 'till next day, nor the Minister to see the Consul 'till Wednesday; on Wednesday evening or Thursday morning I should have my answer. I told him I would not waste my time in Paris, but would go to the country 'till then, and requested I might not be again disappointed. I clearly see they want to keep me in leading strings, and that everything shall go thro' themselves. I have, however, requested Delaney to apply to Defermat to procure the interview for me, if I shall have occasion to solicit it, and hope for the answer when I go to town.

"More airs on the part of O'Connor. Dalton, it seems, spoke before him in praise of Mrs. G., by which he showed he had been with me at Cormeil. O'Connor took no notice of this while he

was by, but when he was gone O'C. got into a violent passion and said 'if Mr. Dalton was running after Mrs. G., *and such little people*, he would have nothing to do with him, and that the first interview he had he would complain of his conduct.' I wish his arrogance may break out in time to prevent his being injurious.

"[N. B.—I forgot to remark that in all my conversations with Dalton and Harty I requested the means of sending some one to Ireland, which is always promised, but it appears to me they are in no hurry.]

"*Thursday, 9th.*—I am again disappointed. Mr. Dalton tells me he dined last Sunday with the First Consul, with the company of the Minister at War and Gen^l Massena, and there pressed my request on the Minister at War. They consulted together, and he was informed the Chief Consul could as yet see no one, he said, as formerly; negotiations were still going on, and the mediation of Austria and Russia had been offered and appeared to be accepted. I answered, 'I have done my utmost to see the Consul, I cannot succeed, I hold myself acquitted for the consequences; nevertheless I am vexed, and I believe the refusal a loss for France, what it is for Ireland I suppose is of little consequence to those who have given me the refusal.' He appeared struck with my manner of saying this, and after a little pause offered to give me a written note to the Minister more strongly pressing my demand.

"I then showed him my credentials as they are; he read them attentively, and said he would state them also. I expressed my wish to see the Minister that I might enforce my demand, but added 'for no other purpose.' He assured me he would press it as strongly as he could. Gen^l Harty then came in, and I clearly saw Dalton wished to keep him ignorant of my request, so the conversation dropped. If Harty was a man of business I would apply to him, but besides that defect, I believe he has scarcely access to the great.

"O'Connor has been before me with the Great; he has seen Massena. There is time enough for me to see him when I have anything to do with him. I mentioned to Dalton and Harty Capt. Murphy, and suggested the propriety of putting a swift sailing ship under his command. D. took down his name to

make the proposal; if it be done I will try and send some information by him.

“Friday, 10th.—As we were interrupted yesterday in our conversation, I called this morning to fix a time when I might get my answer. T. Corbett was there, which again prevented a particular explanation. D. however took the opportunity of mentioning that the Minister had been called at eleven yesterday to St. Cloud by the accounts from Hanover, and did not return that day. In the same way I took the opportunity of informing him that I would go to the country and expected to hear from him when he had any answer. In the course of conversation D. mentioned it was believed the French troops from St. Domingo would take refuge in the United States. I asked how many they were; he said, making every allowance for mortality there ought to be ten or twelve thousand. I then suggested that if they waited for a leading west wind they might, in their way home fall unexpectedly on Ireland, and so much more than an armament from Brest, which will be always watched. The thought seemed to strike him a good deal.

“Wednesday, 15th.—Having come to town yesterday evening, I saw Col. Dalton, who referred me to this morning; called on him this morning, when he informed me that he had given a written note to the Minister at War, stating my demands in the most urgent terms, and setting forth my situation, with a literal translation of my credentials. That the whole had been laid before the First Consul, and that he was directed to inform me that affairs were not yet sufficiently advanced to permit of his seeing any person on that subject; that he certainly would invade Ireland if the war went on, and a wish was expressed, as if from him, that the people there might remain quiet 'till his arrangements could be made for the expedition. Col. Dalton also added, that I should be informed as soon as the Consul could see any one. I asked was I to consider this answer as coming personally from him, and Dalton replied it certainly did. In that case I see no use of trying another channel, to experience the mortification of another refusal. I then repeated that it would probably be a severe loss to France, and I hoped not such as she would have lasting cause to regret. I then expressed my anxiety to be as speedily furnished as possible with the means, pecuniary

and otherwise, of sending intelligence to Ireland. He took a note of it, and promised to *see* about it; he mentioned that he had communicated what I suggested about Capt. Murphy, and that he would be sought for and probably employed in that way. I asked about the St. Domingo troops said to have taken refuge in the United States. He said my scheme was impossible, for he had seen a person only yesterday forty-two days from St. Domingo, that the troops had not then quit, and had no thought of quitting it, not having heard of the war. That, therefore, they would have no choice of their place of refuge, and would probably be obliged to sail out expressly to let themselves be taken by the English as the least evil. He mentioned the negotiation was still going on, and I believe they expect peace; at least some persons in the government think so; and Mangot, I believe, the commandant at Bologne, told the owners of the packet boats not to sell their boats, which they were going to do, as the communication would be open.

“Tuesday, 27th.—Not having heard anything since from Col. Dalton, I called on him again to-day, and urged the necessity of being furnished with the means of sending one over to Ireland. He showed me a written note on the subject; from which I collected as if O'Connor had been making a similar application. The demand was certainly strongly urged, and he has promised me to write to me as soon as he gets his answer. I think, however, the French government is only trifling with me, and won't give money or means 'till it sees fit for its own purpose.

“Thursday, 30th.—Having learned from McDowell that some of our countrymen are already in great distress from the stoppage of the communication, and that others were likely to become so, I resolved to speak to Gen. Harty on the subject of providing for them in a military line. Accordingly we both waited on him and urged the subject as strongly as we could. We said we applied to him as a countryman to expedite that for which we did not wish to let down the National character by making a formal application to government. We stated the actual and probable distresses of our countrymen, if not succoured, and also if it was intended to profit by their enemies in Ireland to discipline the natives, that they must themselves learn their business by previous practice, for which the time was scarcely sufficient. He agreed

to all this, but said that without knowing the French politics he could easily see the First Consul did not wish to give England an opportunity of saying he had excited her subjects to revolt. To that we answered by urging the example of England in employing the French Emigrants and the former Irish Brigade, which even existed in time of peace. He endeavoured to make some distinction between those and United Irishmen, which I confess surprised me from him. Tho' I believe it is the real motive why the French Government is so reluctant to use the United Irishmen, because they are considered as *bonâ fide* republicans and Jacobins. He confessed that he plainly saw a stagnation in the French Government since he was first commissioned to speak to the Irish. He then advised the French to be cautious how they allowed the Irish to slip out of their hands, and taking advantage of an expression of Mr. Wickham's in the English House of Commons, 'that the government had it in contemplation to ameliorate the condition of the Irish poor.' I warned him that Ireland had learned by experience that she was to receive nothing from ANY country but what its own interest suggested, and that if England did anything substantial she might conciliate the Irish. I pointed out that the present Administration were inclined to be mild; it had allowed Rowan, Fitzgerald, and Byrne to reside in England, and I was convinced that if I myself or any other person, however obnoxious, made the same request and promised not to intermeddle again it would be granted; that want and necessity might force many to such a step, whose loss France would afterwards very severely feel; that I spoke with more frankness as I never would take anything from the French Government, but it might push its prudence or negligence much too far. This last argument seemed to alarm him, and he promised to speak to the Minister at War on the subject, and urge it as from himself. We also spoke of the unpaid arrears of discontinued pensions, which he likewise promised to mention, and all without delay.

"Monday, July 4th.—Called this morning again on Genl. Harty, but he had not seen the Minister at War, and apprehended he could not until the Consul's return, as the Minister was ordered to join the Consul. I went to Dalton, to urge him also, but he was not at his bureau or lodgings. I learned, however, that he

also was going on a mission, but they could not tell me where, or for how long. I wrote him a letter on the different subjects he had promised to have performed, and which I was apprehensive his departure might derange, and requested to hear from him.

“ I see clearly that the French government are not in a hurry to do anything I have asked, and that the stagnation which Genl. Hartey spoke of has nearly taken place; but how can I help myself ?

“ *Saturday, July 9th.*—This morning, as I was setting off for town, received a letter from Dalton dated last Thursday, and which, speaking of the different matters in my letter says: ‘il n’y a encore aucune solution définitive sur les objets de diverses notes, que j’ai remises, et dont vous avez connaissance; j’attends presque certain que le retour du 1^{re} Consul achèvera notre affaire.’ This did not prevent my proceeding to Paris to ask a passport for a person from General Hartey. When I went there I found that he had, in consequence of McDowell, and my conversation with him, written a letter to McGuire requesting him to communicate to his countrymen his wish of being useful to them, and that in consequence of some communications with the Minister at War he requested each of them to inform him of his christian and surname, of his situation in the Irish Union and his sufferings, and also whether he would wish to serve in a civil or military capacity in the event of an expedition going to Ireland, and further desiring to know who there were to whom pensions had been formerly given and when they were discontinued. This letter was enclosed in another to McGuire desiring him to get answers as far as he could from any Irishman in France, except *O’Connor or me*, whose opinions he already had.

“ This express exclusion of us two has probably arisen from an unwillingness to decide between us which has the most legitimate claim to be acted with and considered as the representative of the United Irishmen. I think too that the Genl was actuated by a personal motive to increase his own importance to the Government, by having the communication with the different individuals himself, which probably could not be the case if he had allowed either of us to interfere, and that I look upon it to be the real object of the exclusion. However, he considered it to proceed in reality from the Minister at War, and therefore pressed most

strongly on me, that my claims should now be brought decidedly forward, that O'Connor's future interference as agent should if possible be prevented by every Irishman putting his signature to my credentials, and by their answering Gen^l Hartey that they would wish any communications respecting them to be made thro' me.—Whether his suspicions be well founded or not, I think his idea good, and have given him the credentials to proceed if he can. I went to Gen^l Harty without appearing to know anything of the matter; he, however, mentioned it, and I saw on his part an anxiety that I should take nothing amiss. I did not, but I neither expressed approbation nor disapprobation of his step. I turned the conversation on the object of my visit. I mentioned that it was now about six weeks since Government had made a communication to me for the purpose of being made known to Ireland, and since I had asked for the means of so doing. That I had often repeated my request since, but without being at all advanced, and that if this was to continue there was no use in doing me the honour of making me a communication. It was true, my situation and that of my country, did not give me very ample means of meeting certain very heavy expenses, but I could not suffer improper delays to take place by a tardiness on the part of the French Government to assist us; that therefore I now asked only a passport for a person to go to Germany, and requested it might be given without delay. That I asked for nothing more, because I did not choose to humiliate myself or my country by continuing to press applications that I thought delicacy should have anticipated, and that made us appear in the light of beggars, while they probably also retarded the progress of business. The General promised to lose no time in the application, but said he could not see the Minister before Tuesday; he asked me should he mention the reason why I only asked for a passport. I told him he might do in that as he thought right.

“He then spoke to me about my appointment, and mentioned Mr. O'Connor's claim. I told him I should permit myself to say nothing about Mr. O'Connor, because I wished to submit those things only to the tribunal of our common country, which as yet had no existence; that as to the appointment I should refrain from saying whether any such actually took place, but supposing it did, as he said in 1797, the Executive from whom he claimed

the appointment were all either dead or exiled, except two who at present certainly did not act; how then could he carry on the necessary correspondence? I was appointed Feb. last, and sent for expressly to Brussels; in consequence I relinquished my design of going to America last spring, and I must peremptorily say I was the only person in France authorized to communicate with the existing Executive. He asked me was that committee known to all the United Irishmen; I answered, the individual members certainly were not, and never could be, but that its existence was to all those who were at present acting and risking their lives and fortunes. That many who had previously acted did not now, and of course as they were out of the organization they were ignorant of its secrets. Perhaps Mr. O'Connor might tell him and really believe there was no Executive, but that was only a proof that he did not know the real state of the country, and that the Committee had no connection with him. I assured him there was one, and if the French Government wished to communicate with it, and with those who were preparing to act, it must be done thro' me. He asked me would I allow him to say to the Minister at War that I would be ready to produce proofs of my appointment when necessary. I answered I certainly would. It is become, therefore, absolutely necessary to ascertain my appointment and silence O'Connor's pretensions, tho' I am convinced doing so will make the matter so public as to reach the English government, and then independent of National inconvenience, probably every farthing of mine in Ireland will be confiscated.

“Thursday, July 14th.—This morning received a letter from Genl Hartey informing me that the Minister had refused the passport, for reasons he hoped I would approve of, and which he would communicate when he saw me, which shall be to-morrow.

“Friday, 15th.—Saw Genl Harty, and was very much surprised to find the refusal was accompanied with no reason at all, for surely this is not one: ‘What is the use of sending a courier, that is but a half measure; we must send a proper force,’ &c. Vexed as I was, and probably shall have often occasion to be, I told the Genl that so far from being satisfied with the answer, I did not think it was common sense. I had said nothing about an expedition, whether it should be large or small, nor did I intend to do

so until the proper time, and then only to the highest authority. That besides I never intended to beg one, because I well knew nothing would procure it but the absolute interest France had in the measure, and then begging was not only degrading but unnecessary. I asked for nothing but a passport for a courier to communicate what the French Government bid me and voluntarily sought me out for the purpose. That if it believed me acting for England it was unquestionably right to refuse my request, but if it thought me faithful to my cause I could scarcely conceive a reason for refusing me a passport, even if it did not know my motive for asking one. I was very sure the reason assigned was not the real one that actuated the Minister in his refusal, and as I was left to conjecture, I could only say that if there was not an entire confidence in me I should be glad to know it, as I would try to get myself replaced by some one who might gain that confidence.

“Gen^l Hartey assured me he was perfectly certain that was not the reason, but confessed he had been himself surprised and was lost in conjecture. Negotiations he said were still talked of, and perhaps an Irish expedition was not seriously intended, or that the plan of operation was not fixed on. I asked him had he any reason to suppose an Irish expedition was not intended. He assured me solemnly not the least, but that he was bewildered in conjecture, and in this I implicitly believe him. After some conversation I determined to ask an audience of the Minister at War, and have written a letter on that subject and given it to the General at dinner to-day, who has undertaken to remit it to the Minister. Hartey before I left him turned the conversation on the steps the Irish here are taking in consequence of his letter to M^cGuire. He tells me they talk of a meeting, which he deprecates for fear of offending the Government, which is suspicious of such things. I assured him I had not heard a word of it, that some of my countrymen wished to transmit their claims thro’ me, that I told them if that was a general wish I was ready to understand it, but that I would not do it for four or five individuals, and that I thought they might as well do it themselves. This he requested might be the case, and rather begged me not to interfere. I communicated his wishes to some of my friends, but this evening I believe I have discovered a clue to his apprehensions. M^r O’Connor, when he heard of Hartey’s letter, got

into a great passion and said that faith had been broken with him, as the Minister at War had promised that he alone should be communicated with on the subject; that Gen. Hartey was raising factions and sedition among the Irish, and that 'Tho' he believed him a worthy man he saw he was a fool and would be obliged not to speak to him.' He spoke a heap of other impertinence and nonsense. I wish he would go on that way and blow himself up, as he is very troublesome and I think will be very injurious. I fancy his anger arose from the fear of my being appointed by my countrymen, but I am pretty sure it is he that has frightened Hartey lest he should be compromised and censured. The signatures to my appointment have not been very much increased by Swiney's exertions. He met a couple of refusals, one of which I could never have expected, and others he did not ask from motives of prudence. The matter, however, is becoming perfectly public, which is what I would willingly have avoided, and my only consolation is that all of my countrymen, as far as I have heard, say they approve the choice, but where are the signatures? I was informed to-day at the proper office that a measure will be taken to exempt all the United Irishmen from being prisoners of war. I hear too that neither Monroe or Livingston, the American Minister, have been able to get passports, owing to some apparent mistake. Can that delay be connected with the cause that produced the refusal to me?

"I forgot to remark that Harty, when he took my letter, said: 'If the Minister refuses or postpones the audience, he certainly will have some reason, and we must wait with patience. If he grants it, take the opportunity of speaking your mind frankly and boldly. I am sure you will do it so as not to displease, and it may be useful.'

"*Saturday, July 16th.*—General Hartey received a letter this morning from the Minister of War, desiring him to conduct me to his Hotel on Monday morning at nine. He also received another in the course of the day from the same, informing him that he was appointed one of a commission of three United Irishmen to decide upon the reclamations of United Irishmen against being made prisoners of war, and desiring him to attend on Monday at the Bureau de la Guerre; he does not know his fellow-commissioners.

“ I find Monroe has got a passport, and is by this time at Calais, but it was with difficulty, and only good for eight days. Livingston has not been able to get one.

“ I understand O'Connor also says a party is forming against him here in Paris; that alludes to my countrymen preferring me as their agent to him. Poor man, he has held the same language,—‘that a party was forming against him’ in prison and out of prison, ever since he became a political character.

“ *Monday, July 18th.*—Hartey and I went to the Minister's this morning at nine, and he was out. This I saw vexed the general, and I let him see that I was displeased at such conduct. I told him my business called me into the country, and that I should stay in town no longer. He said he was sure the Minister had forgotten, and that such was his character. I answered that if it was only forgetfulness it could be easily repaired; that I should request him to write to know whether the Minister's intentions respecting me were changed, and required an answer, as I would make my arrangements to leave Paris at four o'clock. He wrote it, and sent it by his servant, who left the letter at the War Office without waiting for an answer, or asking if the Minister was there. I then told Hartey I should do myself the pleasure of calling on him at half-past three, which would give him an opportunity of seeing the Minister on the other subject—the Commission for examining the reclamations of the United Irishmen, that if there was any satisfactory reason I could then stay in town; if not it was impossible for me to mistake the object of his not being at home this morning. That if I was not allowed to communicate with the French government, or my own country, I was absolutely useless and would employ myself solely about my own private affairs. That when the French Government knew its own mind and was decided what line of conduct it ought to pursue toward me and my country, it would I presume know where to find me. At half-past three I called again and waited 'till four, when he came in. He said the Minister had forgot, and begged him to bring me any morning between ten and eleven, to the Bureau de la Guerre. He had been asked what I wanted to say, which Hartey said he did not know. I then appointed to-morrow. I asked about the commission of three, and learnt for the first time that all about it was a secret not to be talked of, from which and

some other expressions of his I am fully sure the idea is changed,—an attendant to give him any reclamation—he is piqued that more of the Irish have not written to him on the subject of being employed, and seems to think they distrust him. O'Connor too is busy, wanting a list of the United Irishmen prisoners of war, and says that Government have desired him to make it out; can this be true? By Harty's conversation this morning I find O'Connor had been saying he has had the latest intelligence from Ireland, and that there is no Executive, meaning thereby I am no agent. I found it necessary to show Hartey how he had been deceived. O'Connor still continues his talk about the faction against him, but is so good as to say I am not of it,—who is?

“*Tuesday, July 19th.*—I have at length seen the Minister. Whether it was affectation or forgetfulness, or cunning to feel his way, I know not—but at first he did not seem to recollect anything. When I mentioned that I had solicited a passport to send some one to Ireland which he had thought fit to refuse—‘What passport?’ said he; ‘I don’t recollect it.’ Harty then came forward and reminded him he had asked it. ‘But for what object?’ says he. I told him it was now about six weeks since Government had communicated to me its intention respecting Ireland, with the desire that I might transmit it to them, and to do so I asked for the passport. ‘What communication, and by whom?’ ‘By Col. Dalton, who said he came officially, and by Gen. Harty, and the communication was as follows:’ I then detailed to him what is already set forth on that subject. When I came to that part that said Ireland should be at liberty to choose her own form of government, ‘Undoubtedly,’ said he, ‘c’est tout simple; we wish to do England all the harm we can, and we know nothing can do her so much as separating Ireland, but we have no wish to meddle with the internal affairs of that country; but,’ says he, ‘nothing is yet decided on, and why send a message?’ I answered that as the agent of the United Irishmen with the French Government, I had received intelligence from thence, with orders to communicate it only to the First Consul; and for that purpose I solicited the honour of an interview three or four times, and have been refused.

“Minister—‘Who refused you?’

“Emmet—‘It came to me delivered by Mr. Dalton.’

“ M. ‘ But M^r Dalton could do nothing except from me.’ ”

“ E. ‘ I desired my application, Citizen Minister, to be addressed to you, and was told the first answers came from you. I even desired, as I knew the importance of my demand, that an answer might come personally from the First Consul, and was informed the last did.’ ”

“ M. ‘ Yes, I spoke to him, and he said he could see nobody on the subject until his plans were made.’ ”

“ E. ‘ Having received my answer, Citizen Minister, I said no more on that subject, but from what I know of the state of my country I can say it is of the utmost importance that it may be informed to what point it is an object with the French Government, that it may decide as to its own line of conduct.’ ”

“ M. ‘ Yes, a communication of that kind may be useful, but how will you send the Message?’ ”

“ I then told him my ideas, and said when I first applied on this subject I asked for the facilities of sending one, an expression very easily understood, but as that demand might cause delay I do not make it now. I was only a private man in my fortune, and that not large. I would however find funds. ”

“ We then entered into something of a more general conversation, in which I said when the Chief Consul was returned I should be happy in the opportunity of laying before him what had been transmitted to me on the state of Ireland. ‘ Why,’ says he, ‘ his plans are not yet formed.’ I said I suppose not, and I hope they will not be formed until I have the opportunity of making him acquainted with what may change them in some measure. ‘ Oh, as to that,’ says he, ‘ nothing of that kind can make a change in a great plan. Ireland is but an accessory consideration; if it be possible for us to land one hundred and fifty thousand men in England, then we shall make them feel, but as for Ireland there could be no thought of above twenty-five or thirty thousand at the most.’ I answered that would be full enough. On some occasion I mentioned ‘ mes fonctions aupres du gouvernement,’ on which he said, ‘ you are then appointed to discharge some?’—‘ I am, Citizen Minister; otherwise I should never have solicited the honour of being here, and perhaps it is right I should take this opportunity of stating to your Excellency who I am. I was of the Executive Committee, and

arrested in 1798 with many others; I was detained a prisoner in Ireland for a year, and then deported to Fort George in Scotland, where I was kept also a prisoner 'till this time twelve-months, and then conducted in an English frigate to Hamburg. I was going with my family to America, where I was promised the friendship of the leading men in the State, and would have sailed last Spring but that shortly before I received the orders of the acting committee of the United Irishmen and their authorization to proceed to Paris and be their agent with this government. I obeyed them. I renounced my private projects, and it is only as the representative of my country that I shall ever claim any attention or consideration for what I may offer.' 'Do you know Mr. O'Connor?' 'I knew him very well formerly.' 'But you don't see one another now?' 'No, but I hope that can do no mischief to our cause, as there can be no contestation between him and me. I solicit no marks of confidence from the French government on personal grounds. If, when it did me the honour of distinguishing me, in that point of view, I had not had such delegated powers, I should have said that there were many men in Paris who had sacrificed as much, who had suffered as much, whose importance with the people was as great, whose devotion to their cause was as entire, and who in every point of view merited as much the confidence of the French government as I could and I should have requested that they should receive the same marks of confidence as myself. In that point of view I shall not enter into contest with Mr. O'Connor, or any one, and in a delegated capacity neither he nor any one can enter into contest with me.' 'Mr. O'Connor, then, has no such power?' 'None.' 'But he was in France before?' 'He was long since, for one particular purpose.'—'And he was coming over again when he was arrested?' 'He was, and I understand he founds some claim upon it, but the fact is this: In the latter end of 1797, the English government persecuted him a good deal, and he did not choose to stand it any longer; he determined to fly to France, and wished to be authorized to act there. The Committee answered that if he was determined to go he might be useful by co-operating with the established agent for the good of the country, and that agent was written to to co-operate with Mr. O'Connor to that point, and there is the whole of his appointment.—

Since that time, however, great changes have taken place, the former organization was destroyed and everything unhinged, a new one has been established, and of those who were of the Committee, when Mr. O'Connor wished to go to France, all are either dead or in exile except two, who are in no respect concerned in the new organization. So that he has no kind of connection with any body whatsoever now in activity, and if the French Government chooses to learn the state of those who are preparing to take advantage of the present crisis of Europe, who are risking everything and have the means of raising the whole country, I say most pointedly and positively they can only hear from and communicate with that body thro' me, as I alone hold the thread of communication, and I am ready to prove this when called on.'

" 'What do you think of Mr. O'Connor?'

" 'I made no reply.

" 'Frankly now, among ourselves, answer me.'

" 'Citizen Minister, I cannot permit myself to answer you; with the avowed feelings I have towards him, if I were to give an opinion I should almost suspect myself, I am sure you would.'

" General Harty interposed and said there was some quarrel between us at Fort George, with the cause of which he was unacquainted.

" 'I replied, 'Whatever is between Mr. O'Connor and me, I wish to submit only to one tribunal, that of my own country, and until I can do that I do not wish to speak of it.'

" Berthier—'Can he be of service to us?'

" E. 'Every Irishman can be of service to you.'

" B. 'But is he popular in Ireland?'

" E. 'Citizen Minister, it is painful to me to speak of Mr. O'Connor, but you press me so much I can't avoid it. On my word of honour I believe his popularity is lost; he certainly enjoyed a considerable share once, but I am convinced he has none now; in civil convulsions popularity is sometimes very undeservedly acquired and sometimes very undeservedly lost. Which of these has been Mr. O'Connor's case, considering the terms on which we are, I shall not permit myself to say, but you may yourself judge how far his popularity is lost from this,—there is, as I have already had the honour of telling you, a committee in Ireland which has the means of raising the whole country, and Mr.

O'Connor does not even know of its existence. Put it to the trial, ask him, and he will tell you that we all know that the People are ready, but he will say there is no Executive. And in this he will say what he thinks; they have been able to take their measures in such secrecy that the English Government does not know them, nor Mr. O'Connor either, and why? Because they do not wish it to be known to either one or the other, a proof he has not their confidence, and as they do not wish him to know it, so neither do I.'

"Berthier—'You may be assured, Sir, he shall not know it from me. I am happy to have become acquainted with you. Send to Genl Harty the description of the person, you shall have the passport and the funds, and when you have anything to say I shall be happy to see you.'

"I assured him I did not intend to be importunate, but when I had matter of sufficient consequence I hoped to enjoy the honour I had done to-day.

"Harty then mentioned something of the United Irishmen that were prisoners of war. Berthier said to me—'Any that you can vouch for, give in their names to Genl Harty, and they shall be discharged.'

"On our return home I gave him a list. I saw he was pleased with the interview, and particularly that I had spoken of O'Connor. 'I wished,' he said, 'to force it, so that you were right to be explicit as to yourself and your powers, and not to let any doubts arise.'

"Before the interview, during our long attendance, I took the opportunity of pointing out to him that he should not attribute the backwardness of the Irish in giving him their names to any diffidence of him, but only to a diffidence of France, which had abandoned Ireland. During the time of the Directory they would have rejoiced at such an offer, and have offered to fight for the cause of liberty anywhere. But now they are so disgusted with the treatment of individuals and the Nation, that while they can hope to live on their own means they cannot prevail on themselves to accept a French commission, and are rather reserving themselves to fight with an Irish one. He endeavoured to defend the French government, but I could see in his heart he thought his countrymen right.

“I saw Aherne to-day and broached to him a scheme from which I hope a good deal, but he has damped my hopes. If Daendels was in confidence in Holland, I should not despair of doing a great deal without France; but he is as low as can be. He has, however, in a letter lately written expressed his wishes to aid in liberating Ireland and his determination to engage in nothing else, and desired Aherne to make this known to his countrymen here, as Aherne supposes that they may suggest his appointment, which in former times would have succeeded, but who would think of suggesting the appointment of a general to the First Consul, above all of a Republican and a foreigner?

“*Thursday, July 28th.*—From the last date to this I wrote three letters to General Hartey. The first dated 21st was about the description of the person for the passport and the expenses of his journey, for which I declined naming any sum, nothing only what he would have to do. The remainder of that letter and the other two were about the state of the United Irishmen prisoners of war, and urging the necessity of some general regulation in their behalf. This I was particularly induced to do by different letters from individuals stating the hardship of their situation from their removals, etc. In a letter written last night I called for such a measure as their Agent and Deputy, and insisted on it not only as their right, but also as the first proof the French government could give of its good-will towards Ireland. This morning I received a letter from him enclosing the passport and stating his conversation with the Minister on the subject of the funds, on which neither could name any sum and advising me to do it. I have in consequence stated fifty pounds as the least sum with which I would let him set out, and that as much more will be necessary for his return. That whatever is given shall be applied to that purpose only, and that if it be not enough I will endeavour to supply the deficiency. Perhaps I am wrong, but as the sum may appear large I am afraid it might be thought I was wishing to turn a penny, and I have been more delicate than I otherwise would be. As Harty's letter said nothing of the United Irishmen prisoners of war, I again urged their liberation in my note of this morning.

“From the beginning I pressed that matter, from time to time gave in the names of individuals who applied to me and were

entitled to exemption from the *arrête*. It was always promised without any difficulty, and as I thought it would be a matter of course I neglected mentioning my having applied in the proper part of this journal. The delay, however, has been so great and so injurious to individuals that the matter has become of considerable consequence, and my latter applications have been very urgent.

“August 2nd.—This morning came again to town to solicit the money and other things. Called on Gen^l Hartey and found that Dalton had returned and that Hartey had handed all over to him. I had learned before I went there that Gen^l Hartey had told Ware that O'Connor and he were busy about the military arrangements. When I went to Hartey and carelessly asked about them, he said he had given in the names but did not say anything of O'Connor. He also told me Dalton and he were of the committee for examining the reclamations of the United Irishmen. ‘O'Connor,’ says I, ‘is, I suppose, the third?’ He said he believed not, but in such a way as to convince me otherwise. He then took great occasion to convince me that O'Connor was not in more confidence and had not done more than I had. But I am sure he has made good his ground with Hartey and Dalton, and they are both very anxious to keep me in ignorance of the communications they have with him.

“Wednesday, August 3d.—Could not see Dalton yesterday, but did this morning. He apologized for the delays that had taken place about the Irish prisoners, and assured me it would be instantly rectified; which it has been. He also told me he was sure I should get the money, and he would see the Minister the next day. As he was made acquainted with all that had passed in his absence, I took the opportunity of requesting my having solicited a passport might not be communicated to O'Connor; he assured me it should not, and added what I thought was very fair, if there was not a wish to keep me ignorant of the communication with him. ‘The French government,’ says he, ‘wishes to avail itself of the services of both; as for myself, my object is the good of France my country, and of Ireland my country. Whatever my private opinions are respecting you both are known to the Government, but I could not permit myself to appear a partisan of either one or the other.’ I wish he may always pursue that conduct.

“Friday, August 5th.—Came to town on the rumours of an insurrection in Ireland. Find that the fact is true, tho’ to what an extent is uncertain. Most of my countrymen are extremely impatient to give their own and procure French assistance. After a great deal of hunting saw Dalton and asked an immediate interview with Berthier, he is unfortunately out of town, but I am to have it to-morrow. Dalton says he will go over with five hundred men. Saw Fulton [Robert], who promised if the affair should become so serious as to leave him room to work, he would go over and commence his plan of operations [with his torpedoes].

“Saturday, 6th.—Saw Berthier. I asked in the name of my country for the means of going immediately and whether the French Government intended to succour Ireland or not, but that if arms and ammunition, with some light artillery and cannoniers and a sufficient number of men, to protect the debarkation, could be sent without causing any material delay, they would wait. I ought to state that I began with communicating to the Minister the intelligence I had formerly received from Ireland and had wished to make known to Bonaparte. After having asked for the vessel, &c., for my countrymen, he said it might be a very great injury to let them go, as they would be so useful with a large force. I assured him he would meet many such wherever he landed, but he persisted in wishing to retain them. I pressed with my utmost zeal for immediate supplies, however small, and pointed out that the Directory had before lost Ireland by not sending over one hundred men in the time of the Wexford insurrection. He answered, we do not yet know of what extent it is; if it be of consequence it will not be so easily put down; if it be not, it ought not to damage our general plans. I assured him the French Government would make it of consequence if it chose, for from what I had stated he saw the United Irishmen would have acted on sending a supply of arms, &c., and of course the same thing would make the rising now of consequence, even if it were not so before.

“‘The government,’ says he, ‘will not commit such a piece of folly as the Directory did.’

“‘Citizen Minister,’ answered I, ‘the Directory committed a piece of folly, not in sending Humbert with so small a force, but in sending him so late; and it is exactly that piece of folly against

which I wish to guard the present government. I warn you that everything will be decided by promptitude, and if England acts with more rapidity than France, she may suppress the present insurrection. In which case France will vainly endeavour to rekindle it with her large force.'

" 'No,' said he, 'the minds of the people would be so roused and enraged.'

" 'That,' says I, 'would be no equivalent for the discouragement of defeat and the loss of the bravest and most devoted chiefs. Time is in this case of more value than strength, and a very little delay may let the opportunity slip away.'

" 'Fifteen days,' said he, 'would be no great loss of time for a considerable force.'

" I answered, 'Fifteen days certainly would not for a considerable force, but I think no accession of strength could compensate for the difference between fifteen and twenty days.'

" 'At any rate,' said he, 'nothing can be done until the First Consul arrives, which will be in three days, and the courier must not go before that, and his dispatch may be very different.'

" I lamented the absence of the First Consul as a great loss, but he assured me it was not, as he was very prompt to decide, and his decisions were very quickly executed, and repeated, if the insurrection was serious succour could easily come in time. 'With two hundred men,' said he, 'ready to be landed in Ireland, we can't be at a loss to collect the men or arms on any part of the coast, and could almost embark them in a day.' I impressed the necessity of promptitude as strongly as I could find words, and again adverted to the impatience of my countrymen, saying I should be afraid to meet them with an answer that they must wait three days before any decision would be taken respecting them; on which he said, 'your zeal and theirs is very natural and honourable, but the zeal of individuals must sometimes be made to yield to superior arrangements.' On the whole I think he feels the necessity of despatch, but no small force will be given.

"After we had taken leave, Dalton told me he certainly knew that Berthier had written yesterday to the First Consul, and that if succours were decided on, the orders would be very promptly carried into execution. 'In eighteen days after the measure was determined on,' said he, 'we had three thousand men and

everything necessary for the St. Domingo Expedition embarked.' He said his duty was to take a minute of my conversation with Berthier for the Consul's use, and that he would put my arguments as strong as possible. He said also he would try himself to be appointed to superintend the execution of the order, and would do it with the utmost zeal. We talked over some plans for the expedition, and I gave him my thoughts. Dalton in the conversation mentioned what I suspect may have been O'Connor's suggestion: 'A large French force will be absolutely necessary to keep down the people and prevent the horrors of a revolution, such as took place in France.' I perfectly understood the meaning of such language, but wished to avoid seeming to see it, and answered: However great that necessity may be, it is not the present question. Expedition is everything, and for that purpose the force ought not to be great, but a small one should be instantly sent, and send your large force afterwards at your leisure. If we get a small one I hope it will put us into such a situation as not to be dictated to by a large one. I mentioned to Berthier the wish of the Irish to be sent in a vessel under the command of Capt. Murphy, as they knew he would never strike his flag, being as deeply embarked as themselves. His name and Gibbon's was also taken down by Dalton to be sent for as soon as they could be had.

"Wednesday, August 10th.—Called on Dalton to know if the First Consul was arrived, he was not expected at St. Cloud 'till night. —He was preparing a memoir to be laid before him, PARTS of which he read to me, strongly pressing the necessity of promptness. While we were talking Corbet rapt at the door, and Dalton broke up the conversation by assuring me he was certain the First Consul would see the necessity of speedy succours and give them. I shortly went away, and Corbet followed me. He began by lamenting the insurrection as blasting all our chances. I answered him, but he almost put me in a passion by dealing out what I clearly saw were O'Connor's rodomontades. He then told me it was on another subject he wished to speak to me,—that as the business was begun it was the duty of every Irishman to give it support. For that purpose many of them wished O'Connor and me to forget our animosities and concert and act together, and that O'Connor was perfectly willing. In fact it

seemed to me, and I believe was an offer from O'Connor to pull up what he might have lost of credit with the French Government, by saying there was no Executive, or organization, and to replace himself by my means. I instantly answered that if my objections to Mr. O'Connor were only personal, I should be ashamed to refuse an offer of reconciliation at such a time; that such, however, was not the case, as all personal matters between him and me were settled at Hamburg; that my objections to him were *moral and political*. That I conceived him a bad man and a very dangerous character for my country, and should ever reproach myself if on any occasion I lent him the credit of my name with those, be they few or many, who thought well of me, and thus increase his means of doing mischief. That, however, as he, Corbet, would not probably like to carry back such a message, he might say what was further the truth, that I saw no necessity for any such communication. I acted only as the agent for the Provisional Government of Ireland, and that situation I could not divide with any one. That I was pressing the French Government for the most speedy succours, and as he said Mr. O'Connor was doing the same, the two applications would perhaps have more weight separately. Corbet tried to persuade me that O'Connor was not a dangerous man, and had no bad intentions respecting Ireland; at any rate that it would be prudent to co-operate with him to a certain point, but I answered I had already sufficiently acted with and knew him to form my opinion of his ambition, his principles, and his morality, and that I was convinced of the folly and wickedness of such a half measure. If none such had been adopted with Robespierre, he would never have been able to load France with the crimes and calamities of his time. I said a great deal more to the same purpose. Swiney met us, and I took him aside to ask him to sign my credentials, which he declined, taking it *ad referendum*. In the course of the day McDonnell, McNeven, and Swiney called on O'Connor, formally acquainting him with my appointment and giving him the opportunity of signing it. He read it over three or four times, and seemed vexed and confused, but evaded on the grounds that he was applied to by the French Government to negotiate with them for Ireland, and that he had no knowledge of the Executive Committee that appointed me; for the particulars

of this I refer to their statement; he also said if I chose to co-operate with him he was ready. It seems Humbert called on him and is by no means satisfied with his reception. O'Connor, however, told him it was not yet decided whether Massena or he was to have the command, but that he would employ Humbert! McSheehy was at the same time with O'Connor in private conference.

"I am perfectly convinced that it is in agitation to take up O'Connor for a bad purpose. Query, is he to be the Prefect of Ireland? I have no doubt that he has let the Government into the secret that I and my friends are Republicans and that he is not; it must be confessed he is fitter than we are for their views.

"*Thursday, August 11th.*—McSheehy called on McNeven and had some conversation with him about the necessity of my resigning my situation and claims to O'Connor, as he had already treated with the French Government, was known and confided in by those who were entrusted with the Marine and War Departments, I believe Bernadotte and Trugnet. McNeven answered as I should, denied the fact of his having before treated, and said I could not resign my situation to any one, but that I would entirely withdraw myself if any hint was authentically given me by the French Government that my interference was not agreeable. In which case it would be observed that Government was treating only with an individual and not with the Irish people. That, however, I had every reason to be convinced I possessed the confidence of the French Government as much as Mr. O'Connor. After a little while McSheehy took his leave.

"*Saturday, 13th.*—Saw Dalton this morning; he had not yet his answer, but told me it had come to their ears from the Police that the Irishmen were talking and committing indiscretions in the coffee-houses, and that a paper was handed about among them for signatures. I interrupted him to ask him had they said anything against the French Government; he said not, but that in consequence of his name having been mentioned, the G^d Juge, with whom he is acquainted, sent for him. I then told him the paper for signatures was the authentication of my appointment, which I had already shown him, and had not gotten signed before from motives of secrecy, but that now no such caution was necessary. That the Irish in signing it were only obeying the orders of their

Government, and I was convinced the French Government would not interfere to prevent their obeying their own. That as to indiscretions, if any were committed, they were faults, but I must doubt it. Many of these men who are perhaps so accused knew of the proceedings in Ireland some months back, but they were all able to keep their own secrets so as that neither the English Government, the French Government, nor the Irish who had not the confidence of the Irish Government discovered anything, and rely on it if anything should occur that it would be proper to conceal in the same manner you will hear nothing of it. But now that there is no mystery they may surely indulge in expressions of zeal and satisfaction. The paper for signatures can be of no importance to the French Government, but it is very natural to Mr. O'Connor; and your conversation reminds me of one Genl Harty had with me some time since. I then told him Harty's conversation about the danger of clubs and meetings, &c., and went on, tho' thro' delicacy I did not say so, I was well convinced all those fears were put into his head by Mr. O'Connor, who dreaded its being seen how entirely he was destitute of the confidence of his countrymen. And I have now the same belief that this is, and from the same motive, the suggestion of Mr. O'Connor. Dalton said he did not know if Mr. O'Connor was acquainted with the G^d Juge. 'Nor do I, but if I were to indulge a suspicion, after what you have told me, I should say it came entirely from Mr. O'Connor.' But says Dalton, '*Comme vous êtes chef reconnu vous devriez être un peu despotique avec les Irlandais.*' On which I smiled and told him I hoped I should never be despotic over any one, but that even if I were inclined to exercise an act of power I really saw no room, as I was convinced there had been no fault. We had some further trifling conversation, in which talking of the necessity of a large French force in Ireland, he said it would be necessary for a time that the French should assume the management on themselves and settle everything. That is, said I, provided you don't find a Government ready formed on your arrival. 'Oh,' says he, 'the French are so well acquainted with the mode of making revolutions, a French general wittily said to an Austrian general who wanted to revolutionize a country against the French,—*"General, you had better not try that game against us or we may*

give you enough of revolution." ' I laughed, as became me, at the French general's wit, but said nothing of the application, nor shall I 'till the fulness of time and 'till I see how the affairs of my country stand. Perhaps we too may show them that we know a little of making revolutions, and that the best way is to stop knaves at the outset. While I was speaking to him a messenger came to him from the Minister to go there directly. On my return home I met Bonneville, who has long been eager to introduce me to Garat, and thro' him to Trugnet. He had been speaking to Garat on the subject, and stated my situation. I am to see him to-morrow morning. But in the outset Bonneville made a great fault. Garat is personally acquainted with O'Connor, and has been speaking to him, and he mentioned the absolute necessity of my acting with O'Connor, on which B. promised that we should be reconciled. On my saying 'never,' he got into a great passion, but I persevered and told him before he promised for me he should have consulted me and insisted on his undeceiving Garat before I went there, which he will do.

"Have just seen Dalton again in consequence of a note from him. The Minister sent for him to communicate the First Consul's answer to me. Which is that he cannot personally see me, because he could not do so without recognizing me and the Provisional Government, which he cannot do until there are twenty-five thousand Irish troops joined to his in Ireland. That he will not send less than twenty-five thousand men, and of this resolution I may be sure, but that he will accelerate all his preparations with the utmost speed, and that these twenty-five thousand men are not intended to stay in Ireland, but to annoy the western coast of England, that in the meanwhile we shall have arms and ammunition as much as we can want from the English arms in Hanover thro' the Elbe, which is not so strictly blocked. That they may be smuggled out, and north about, to Ireland; that he wishes as most important that the Irish should contrive means of opening a communication with France; and further that he assured us he would never make peace with England except on the condition of the independence of Ireland being recognized. We had then some conversation about the means of getting the arms from the Elbe, and requested that Murphy should be sent for and a vessel instantly given him, which will I hope be the case. I

asked him when he thought such a force could be got ready, and he said scarcely before two months, and that he was sure it would not be delayed longer, and that about the Equinox I would see a very general move. I wished for some arms from the western ports of France. He said if it was absolutely necessary he believed they would be given, but that it would be a great inconvenience, as they would want arms for the grand expedition and must collect all they could and even bring some to that quarter for that purpose. I spoke about the eagerness of my countrymen to be gone and he said 'I am not officially desired to tell you, but I know the government attaches great importance to having as many Irishmen as possible with the grand expedition.'

"He further added that if I desired it the Minister would repeat the message he had delivered. I said that tho' it was perfectly unnecessary for myself I should wish it for the sake of others. He will see the Minister on the subject.

"*Sunday, August 14th.*—Saw Garat and had a very long conversation with him. He first mentioned about O'Connor, of whom he spoke very highly, and assured me his views were the most simple and candid, that he claimed no authorisation and said he was nothing but O'Connor, an individual whose name was known thro' Europe and whose suffering might entitle him to some credit. And that all he asked was an immediate force, with which he was ready to go. I told him Mr. O'Connor's claims had not been always so confined, and that as he, Garat, was only three days in town he was probably ignorant of what had been previously claimed, that however now, as he claimed nothing except as O'Connor, and that I claim nothing as Emmet, there could be no contestation between us. We both, it seemed, gave the same advice and solicited the same things for Ireland, therefore we could not counteract each other. He seemed convinced, and said it only came to this that I should remain here as Minister and O'Connor go with the Expedition. I answered precisely, provided the French Government in sending him did not interfere with the prerogative of the Irish Government. We then went into what was necessary to be done. Garat seemed to hint something as if he was appointed to speak on those things. But I believe he has no authority except his friendship with Trugnet.

"However, I stated what I thought would be the advantages

of an immediate recognition of me and my country by France, stating that I had reason to apprehend it would not be immediately done and would not press it, but that if the French Government thought fit to offer it, I would accept it. He knew from Bonneville that I had desired to see Bonaparte and wished I could. I said nearly the same thing, that I did not think it would be granted, and would not let myself down by subjecting myself to repeated refusals; but that if he or his friends could procure me the offer of that honour I would gladly use it. That, however, the material thing was to get succours and to get them instantly. I pressed promptitude and velocity with my utmost strength, and he appeared to enter perfectly into my views. In the conversation he mentioned as a fact that at the time of Humbert's and Hardy's expedition the command had been offered to Cherin, the friend of Hoche, who he said would have done it well, that he demanded twelve thousand men and sunk down to eight thousand, but would never go lower, that it was then offered to Bernadotte who asked fifteen thousand and would not go lower than twelve. I however endeavoured to convince him that less force would have done, and said I was afraid the rock on which the French would split was the desire to do things 'en grand.' He talked of being ready in six months, but I deprecated the delay of half that time. He said the Marine was not ready, there was no more than five sail of the line in Brest and their crews not complete. However, he was very sensible of the importance of Ireland and the necessity of instant action in her defence. On the whole I was pleased with him and he gave me room to think he was so with me, but did not talk of presenting me to Trugnet, that however I hope will come in time and soon.

"Bonneville has told me this evening that after I was gone Garat said he saw I was the proper person to be taken up and that he would see some one tomorrow.

"*Monday, August 15th.*—Called on Dalton this morning to fix about seeing the Minister, he has not met him since, but gave me a rendezvous for tomorrow. As Garat's talk of six months has frightened me, I asked him if he seriously thought the expedition could be ready in two months,—he seemed to laugh at any further delay and assured me that before Vendémiaire I should see it so, 'Marine et tout?' 'tout, tout.' I told him one reason for my

wishing to see the Minister was because I annexed considerable importance to an expression he had mentioned to me from the Consul, and that I wished neither to deceive myself nor my countrymen, I alluded to his assurance that he would never make peace with England 'till the independence of Ireland was recognized. Dalton said it came expressly and personally from the first consul. 'Vous pouvez leur assurer de ma part' were his words. I then said the Directory had given the same assurance, and peace was made without that condition. He then remarked the difference between one man and five, but said your best assurance is your interest; promises and even treaties are every day broken and writing is scarcely more solemn with Nations than words, but their interest is the certain hold.—It is the interest of France, recognized for ages but now more strongly felt than ever, to separate Ireland from England. I said—'it was her interest in the last war but it was not done.' Dalton said, 'but it is now more strongly felt than ever, *and has penetrated those it did not before*. England has forced it to be felt. We hoped that the treaty of peace would have been kept and that we could have arranged ourselves with her, but she has made us feel that she will war against our prosperity while she has the means. The separation of Ireland is the only way of destroying those means, and its advantages are so strongly felt that no one thinks of discussing them. I can assure you that sentiment has penetrated into *every quarter* and that conviction is your best security. Government is convinced that France can not have solid peace with England 'till Ireland is her ally and her friend.'

"*Tuesday 16th.*—In consequence of a message from Bonneville last night, I called upon him early this morning. He then told me that Garat had seen La Place, who had consented to wait on Bonaparte on Irish affairs. If Garat would be present at the interview, to which Garat has consented, perhaps it may produce good. I expressed my wish to know Trugnet, which he said he would try to bring about. McNeven mentioned to me on my return home that he had from authority, on which he could rely, that O'Connor alledges that the Provisional Government is only a faction to exclude him, and that all who support it are in the same faction. I hope it may be immense and irresistible. The same authority also assured McNeven that O'Connor is urging

the French Government to send over with the troops a constitution and regulations of Government to impose on the Irish, and that he is urging this against their wish, as they think it would be very impolitic and dangerous! If that be true—voilà un traître! McNeven assigned very strong reasons against such an act. Dalton and I saw the Minister while we were waiting. *D.* said he knew with certainty, and repeated the expression, that Government is directing the utmost attention to the Marine, and that in a short time I should see a '*belle réunion de vaisseaux.*' I said that was the point where I dreaded a deficiency, he said I need not have the least apprehension, that they would collect more than enough of ships of the line and the force would depart from one port. I talked of the necessity of quickening the preparation against England, he said the activity was immense, that he believed they would be ready in four months, but that they would begin to menace long before so as to prevent sending troops to Ireland. When the Minister entered he repeated the conversation as Dalton had done, and asked did I know the best places for sending the arms. I told him four places had been indicated to me before the insurrection, that I could not however say what their actual situation might now be. He seemed to wish to put off the sending of arms 'till the arrival of accounts from Ireland. But I tried to dissuade him from that delay and he said I must give him a note of what I thought the most proper places and why. However, on further explanation he seemed to come off of that and consented that Murphy should be sent for and no time lost. I pointed out we had already let twelve days elapse since the arrival of the last accounts. We had some further conversation on the subject and he wished some vessels to come express from Ireland to receive arms, over to Bordeaux, or the western coast, and to establish the most speedy communication. I then reverted to the remainder of the Consul's answer and said that as to acknowledging me if I were to advise I might perhaps give it contrary to the opinion entertained by the Consul, but no matter for the present the most essential thing was succour and not acknowledgement. I then said there was part of the answer to which I attached very great importance, and wished to know whether I over-rated it. I meant the assurance that he would never make peace with England, 'till the independence of Ireland

was recognised. I requested to know whether that was intended as a formal assurance on the part of the French Government to my country men, and whether I should formally communicate it as such. He answered 'Yes, certainly,' and that it was the Consul's intention I should do so. I then asked him when he thought the expedition would be ready, he said it was hard to say, and seemed to wish to parry the question, but I said I did not mean by asking it to BIND the Government to the time mentioned, but that it would be a great object to those in Ireland to know when, as they would accordingly make their own arrangements. He then said he was pretty sure in about two months, but that with twenty-five thousand men it was hard to be precise and that besides 'on les préviendra.' He bid me try and make them if possible be quiet 'till the French came, which proves two things,—1st that this government does not wish them to be up on its arrival, and 2nd that even on the idea of their being put down it intends to continue its activity, and give them speedy help. The rising therefore had had this effect, even if it shall have failed, that it has quickened the French and determined them to do in two months what they had no notion of doing before six months. I then asked the proper passport and the money for the messenger, which he has promised me by one o'clock today. I have received the money and more, for instead of one hundred pounds he has sent me one hundred and twenty-five and the passport and the messenger will be off tonight.

*"From Thursday, 25th August, to Wednesday, September 7th.—*I was all this time in Paris, but having forgotten my journal I could not take a correct diary.

"On Wednesday the 24th of August, Capt. Murphy called on me after his arrival from Ostend, and we went into town together that evening. Next day I called on Dalton and informed him of Murphy's arrival, requesting that a proper nautical person might be appointed to confer with us on the best mode of sending arms. This I did in consequence of my previous conversation with Murphy, who convinced me that the idea of sending arms from the Elbe in Merchant vessels was absurd, and that they should go from the Western Coasts in armed vessels. I also made Murphy write to the Minister of Marine, mentioning his arrival as he was coming upon an invitation from him before he received mine.

“He has never heard anything from the Minister of Marine, and as for myself I was promised an answer in a couple of days, and afterwards put off on one pretext and another from day to day, and finally promised it definitely on Saturday night, Sept. 3^d. During all this time rumours were circulating of some negotiation with England and an armistice talked of. I mentioned it to Dalton, and his answer was, that peace was impossible, but that an armistice might be, as it was for the interest of France. Having received no answer on Saturday night, I did not ask to see the Minister at War because I knew he was perfectly acquainted with my request and had conversed on it to Dalton. But I prepared a memorial to Bonaparte, calculated also to meet the possibility of negotiation and urging the utmost possible speed on the score of the interests of the Republic, and concluding with the same request I had made thro’ Dalton, as a preliminary to sending the promised arms. Having finished this I determined, if possible, not to send it thro’ Berthier, that in case he heard of it, he might see I felt the impropriety of not giving me some answer and I requested Garat to deliver it, which he understood to do in the handsomest manner. He further told me he had reason to know that Government was very anxiously occupied about our affairs. He had on a former occasion told Bonneville that Bonaparte was afraid to separate Ireland lest it should be too democratic and give a bad example, but that he was strongly urged to it by the Senate and the members of the Government. He further told me our marine affairs were in the hands of Trugnet, who was devoted to our cause. Having secured the delivery of my memoir on Friday I wrote a note to Dalton, rather drily informing him that as I had received no answer and now expected none I was returning to the country. War has been these several days past talked, and movement made against Portugal. Is it possible that could be only a pretext for marching the troops from Bayonne to Ferrol to embark them for Ireland?

“*Sunday, Sept. 11th.*—Came to town again today to be in the way and hoping to hear about my memorial. To my mortification Bonneville has given McDonnell a message for me, stating that it had been impossible to deliver it on Friday, from some etiquette, but that he would do it today. I must therefore wait some days more even if it is to be honoured with any notice.

“Tuesday, 13th.—In consequence of a message from Dalton and some minor circumstances, about prisoners at War &c., I called on him. The only thing remarkable in the interview is that he apologised for not giving me an answer to my demand, by stating that he had none to give, that he had often pressed the Minister on the subject but could obtain no answer, and that he presumed Government had changed its intentions on that subject. This last I am sure is also true by their conduct respecting Murphy, to whom, unknown to me, Dalton made an offer to restore him to his former rank of Captain of a frigate, if he would put himself at the disposition of the Government. Murphy accepted it as he said in everything for the good of his country, but insisted on having a regular brevet, which he was promised. This was all done unknown to me, but, no brevet or written promise coming, Murphy mentioned to me last night that he would go to the country if he heard nothing more about his arrears of pay, giving me to understand that there was no other subject of conversation between him and Dalton in the interview, which after a good deal of hesitation he told me had taken place. This morning I told Dalton, in a general way, that if he was not quick in his movements he would lose Murphy, who mentioned to me his fixed resolution of going back to Dunkirk on Saturday if he had nothing satisfactory before. On this Dalton, supposing Murphy had told me all, said he would go to the Minister of Marine directly and have his brevet made out, that he had been so expressly authorised to make him the offer by the Minister of Marine, and that he need not be uneasy. By Murphy’s agreeing to put himself at the general disposal of the French Government, and by his wish to keep the treaty concealed from me, I see that he has changed his mind as well as the French Government. God knows how I could get the arms over, even if a favourable answer should be given to my memorial. Dalton sets off tonight to Strassbourg on a mission to conduct the Turkish Ambassador to Paris and in his absence everything referred again to Harty.

“Wednesday, Sept. 14th.—Saw Bonneville this morning. Garat had not been able to deliver the memoir on Sunday, for when he went to St. Cloud, he found that the Consul had no audience and was gone to Malmaison. He has requested a special audience for to day to give it. On my way home met Corbet, who began,

as on a former occasion, by condemning the measures in Ireland, as if to conciliate my temper, and then proposed an accommodation with O'Connor that we might co-operate, saying 'that as matters were going on it were to be wished that they could be succoured.' I rejected every accommodation on the same grounds as before, political and not personal. He urged that if we were reconciled O'Connor would sacrifice a great deal of his opinions to meet mine and give a joint advice to Government. I answered that I knew Mr. O'Connor too well not to be convinced that if we did appear to co-operate and give a joint advice, which did not meet his views, he would nevertheless find means to suggest and enforce his own, so that nothing would be gained on that head. That besides I only acted in a delegated capacity, which I could not divide with anyone, and would not willingly share with Mr. O'Connor, that I wished for nothing but what I knew my countrymen required, and gave no advice but what flowed from their wishes. That I could never consent to modify these solicitations, or that advice, to meet any ideas of Mr. O'Connor, and that in seeking for a counsellor to assist me with his opinions and judgements I should only choose one on whose integrity and talents I had reliance. That as to co-operation, if we did not really agree in opinion, Mr. O'Connor would, I was persuaded, in every situation, openly or secretly urge his own; if we did agree, there was a virtual co-operation without our coming together. The advice I gave to Government, and urged with all my strength was this, to lose no time, to give the utmost they could instantly and as much as possible at their leisure, but to succour as soon and as powerfully as possible those who were now acting. I hoped Mr. O'Connor did not give different advice. I hoped he did not tell them that the present insurrection was trifling and insignificant and the work of some obscure men, that he did not advise them to let it die away, and not to go but with a large force, that might enable them to take things up 'de novo,' to come with a ready made constitution for the Irish people, and to interfere with the civil authority of the country, under specious and hackneyed pretext of *keeping down factions*. I said all this, it being ascertained from the information McNeven had received, from I know excellent authority, that such is his language. When I mentioned the words 'keeping down factions'

Corbet, conscious he had often sung second to O'Connor, said he himself was very apprehensive they would be wanting at first for that purpose, that the spirit of individual revenge would be let loose and that they alone could not curb the overflowing of popular fury. I answered that they showed no disposition to go in time to stop those outrages which, I lamented as much as anyone, were likely to disgrace the first beginning of our revolution. That besides if they were there, they would not care whether this or that private individual was cruelly massacred, it was too petty an object for their attention. They would interfere en grand, espouse some party and then oppose its rival under the name of keeping down faction, that I was for no such mediation of foreigners and would submit to none in Ireland but that of the Irish people. That if the French came, they must prepare themselves to act only as allies, and as such indeed not to let the laws of the land and the obligations of morality and humanity be violated in their neighbourhood without securing the culprit, and submitting him to the tribunal of his country. But that whoever should advise them to erect themselves into Mediators in a land aspiring to be free, between rival parties, if any such should exist, would prepare for that land new and not less destructive civil wars than any she had ever yet encountered. That I hoped no one was giving them that advice, or suggesting to them to dispose of offices in the Irish Government as they might think fit. The argument did not end here, for Corbet defended his opinion, but with such arguments as I really forget. In urging me to the reconciliation with O'Connor what an effect it would have in deciding the resolutions of the French Government if it saw us co-operating. To that I answered drily, that after what the French knew of the state of Ireland, of its importance and its wants, I should think very meanly of its politics and talents if it were induced to send an additional soldier or musket by any appearance of co-operation between Mr. O'Connor and me. He then attempted to touch my fears, by talking of O'Connor's great influence in Ireland, and that those who knew the services he had rendered to his country would not suffer him to be put down. I told him I had long acted with Mr. O'Connor and knew his services a great deal better than those who had heard of them from his own lips, that at any rate when Ireland was free, let his

country estimate what he had done, what he had not done, what he had boasted of having done and what he had arrogated to himself of others' acts and let it give him whatever situation it pleased. I should never intrigue against it, but I was decided never to fill any situation that should come in contact with his, except perhaps as members of the same legislature; we separated, neither I believed perfectly pleased with the other. He almost avowed that he was acting by O'Connor's desire, the same man that in the height of his calumnies against McNeven and me said to several, and I believe to Corbet, that he would never act with either of us; he never shall. When I met Corbet he was reading the papers, which contain, whether true or false, some strong reports of great success on the part of our friends in Ireland, as did some of yesterday's papers. I suspect they are the cause of O'Connor's advances; when I pointed them out to Corbet he seemed as melancholy as if he considered them in the light of disasters. I have my own to regret, but I do so in private. A messenger is arrived at Bordeaux from Ireland and on his way to me. I can learn that he has some not unfavourable and some very bad and to me very distressing news. My brother Robert is arrested, he has been three times before the Privy Council, but has declined answering anything. My brother-in-law John Pattem was arrested and liberated and is arrested again, so that now almost every male relative I have in Ireland that I know and love is in prison and perhaps in danger. God protect them to their friends, their families and country! My wife and I have determined to keep this secret as long as possible, not to discourage our countrymen in Paris. If the news from Holland shall turn out true we shall not be long bound to concealment.

"Saturday, September 17th.—The messenger, Byrne, is arrived in Paris. He left Dublin on Wednesday, August 31st. This news I am far from thinking favourable, because it is clear to me that no new effort will be soon made in Ireland and that everything must now wait upon the French. He has given me an account of the previous proceedings of the Provisional Government, and of its efforts on the 23rd, by which I see there was a great deal of money and talent expended on an enlarged and complicated plan, which would perhaps have been better directed to one single point and to a simple plan. The failure seems to

show this, for it failed for want of heads and means to make the different parts support one another. The present state of Ireland he says is this,—the Provisional Government still maintains its connections and correspondence with the country and the English government really knows little or nothing. The people are in excellent spirits and none of the fire arms have been lost, but a great deal of ammunition and pikes. The Insurrection of the 23rd inst. was forced on by the explosion of the powder manufactory in Patrick Street, and a slight battle for recovering some ammunition a few nights before, but the country in general was not called upon or expected by the Provisional Government to act unless Dublin had been taken. Russell's proclamation was not intended by him to be published 'till Dublin was taken, but it transpired from the over zeal of some friends. In the same way the proclamation of the Provisional Government was not to have been published 'till the next day and was not therefore signed by the members. If no persecutions are permitted the people will be quiet 'till the French come, and the instructions to me were to urge an expedition with the utmost speed. But as to arms, if they come they would be received and concealed, but not used before a landing, and that therefore it was useless to run the risk of sending them. My brother, he says, is not in danger, but I doubt that. John Patten expected to be let out the day after Byrne came away. He says the people's spirits have received a spring by the effort and that if a speedy landing takes place they will act much better than they would have done.

“*Sunday, September 18th.*—Dalton, who did not go to Strasbourg, called this morning very early from the Minister at War, to learn the news brought by the Messenger. I told him in substance as before. When I said I would not press for arms he was very glad of it and told me several captains of ships had declined carrying them and that Captain Murphy himself when spoken to by the Minister of the Marine, seemed very averse to it, that the idea had been therefore dropped as it was not thought right to risk his being hanged on such a business, when he might have been made useful in another way. This might have been a very right decision, but I should have been made acquainted with it either by Murphy, or the French Government.

“As to the expedition itself, he gave me the greatest assurance,

he said the activity at Brest and the western coasts was without example. He had seen and spoken to a person just returning from thence, that he could assure me with certainty there were eighteen sail of the line there ready for the sea. The French Government wished to direct attention from that quarter and were therefore making great demonstrations towards England and establishing camps along that coast to prevent alarm, and because they were unnecessary, 'for Brittany was as full as an egg of troops,' which would not be collected together 'till they were wanted. And that for the same reason of preventing alarm, Government had spread the report that Massena had refused going. I asked him when things would be ready, he answered he thought very well by the end of Vendémiaire. I hinted about the Bayonne expedition and said every one at Bordeaux believed it was for Ireland, which I lamented if it was the fact, as no place abounded more with English spies. He answered in a very pleasant manner, not contradicting, that it was, but certainly not saying it,—'Mr. Emmet' says he, 'it is impossible to prevent persons forming and uttering their conjectures, but I can assure you solemnly that not a word in writing has passed on the subject of that army, and that every arrangement respecting it has been made by word of mouth between the First Consul and the General himself.' He further told me that he had strong reason for believing that Bruix would command the expedition for Ireland, tho' he was now Admiral of the flotilla at Boulogne. This last news, from what has been said of Bruix in Hoche's expedition, I did not think the most pleasant. In consequence of the communication from Ireland and what Dalton said of the intentions of the French Government respecting arms, I sent to prevent Simpson sailing for Ireland, as accidents have hitherto strangely delayed him and a messenger from me with the same intelligence has departed from Bordeaux. I also called on Bonneville to prevent the presenting of my memoir, it has not been yet done. While I was out Mr. O'Connor and I met plump at the turn of a street. To my surprise he instantly saluted me and enquired very tenderly after my family. I answered him as coldly as I could with politeness, but he was not to be rebuffed. He said he had long wished for this opportunity of speaking to me on a subject which had been probably mentioned to me by Mr. Corbet. The

French Government were making communications to us both and as far as he could collect holding different language to each, that it had not concealed from him the assurances it had given to me, which were much larger than any he had received, and that it enabled me to send a messenger with them to Ireland. That the Government had also at different times pressed him to send over messengers, but as he was not satisfied with their sincerity he had always refused and if he had sent one he would have done it out of his own pocket. He believed the French Government wished to deceive us both, but they did it in such a bungling manner as not to deceive him, for they made him at different times different and inconsistent proposals, and besides he had learned facts from different sources which he was enabled to have access to by means of his fortune and character and connections, which laid open to him the views of the French.

“As I might not have the same advantages, and as it was of importance that no one treating for Ireland should be deceived, he wished to propose to me that we should make an unreserved communication of everything that had been said to each, or that had come to our knowledge from other quarters, as being the best way to prevent either of us from being outwitted. But that as in doing so he would have to commit to me the lives of persons who might suffer for their confidence in him, he could only do it on the most solemn obligation of secrecy, which on his part he was also willing to give. He then launched out on different topics, which, as I presume the conversation was to be understood as confidential I shall not even commit to paper. I listened with the utmost patience and silence to this discourse, in some parts very arrogant, but on the whole containing a very artful proposal, and from his desiring me to remember that he had made it, I suspected he was laying the foundation of some future impeachment. I therefore answered him that I did not think myself at liberty to disclose the communications that had been made to me and was aware how little right I had to ask a disclosure from him when I could not be reciprocal, that, however, if his love of his country could induce him to dispense with that reciprocity, which scarcely appeared necessary as his opinion of the insincerity of the French seemed founded on such decisive evidences, I would give him every obligation of secrecy that could pass between man

and man. He replied he could not conceive how I was bound up, the French Government had never tied him up to secrecy. They had communicated very freely with him and they did not conceal their communications with me. They gave him to understand that he was the principal person and an 'homme D'Etat' had been expressly appointed to treat with him and empowered by the First Consul to sign any agreement in writing with him, but they had never asked secrecy from him, nor would he have given them any such promise. That he acted only in his own individual capacity, tho' he knew how very easy it would be to call together some of his friends, make them take the title of an Executive and give him a nomination. But he pretended to no delegated power and he told the French Government so; his only wish was that we should be both enlightened and understand one another for the purpose of not being duped, that he had very important things to tell me and could not do it without the most solemn obligations and an unreserved communication. That once the French Government wished us to be reconciled, but now he believed such a circumstance would be regarded with jealousy, and that the best way would be to meet in the country, where our interview would be unsuspected and unknown to anyone but ourselves. This proposal was made at the front of the Palais Royal after the conversation had lasted for about three-quarters of an hour, and as I thought had been studiously protracted in hopes of its being perceived by some one to whom we and our differences were both known.

"I answered again that the different situations in which we stood rendered a difference of conduct necessary, he acted for no one and was free to tell his own secrets, I was only an agent for others and did not feel myself at liberty to disclose the communications that had been made to me for their use, particularly to him who had refused to acknowledge their authority, that in whatever assurance I had transmitted to my countrymen I had endeavoured not to deceive them, and I trust I had succeeded. But that I would be exceedingly anxious to have every information which might prevent my doing so great an injury and would gladly give him every possible assurance that whatever he told me should never pass my lips, and that the time and manner of doing it should be entirely at his disposal. He then mentioned several

things which, whatever importance I may attach to them, as they were probably given under that assurance, I shall not state, they were not facts but inferences, intended to excite my curiosity as to the facts themselves. He said he could not disclose his secrets without knowing mine. He desired me again to remember he had made the proposal, to think on it, and give him a definitive answer, which he had a reason for wishing me to give before Tuesday at twelve.

"I said I would, and very politely concluded this extraordinary interview. My conjecture on the whole is that O'Connor is dissatisfied with the French Government; notwithstanding their flattery, he is not convinced he is of sufficient importance, and he wishes to ascertain whether I am of more. As to the facts of which he boasts I don't believe he has any, but I suspect this day's conversation will at some future time be made a subject of conversation.

"*Tuesday, 20th September.*—I sent O'Connor his answer to the same purport as above by Corbett. Garat has not delivered my memoir, but as he demanded the interview and does not know whether it may not be still granted, he wishes to keep the memoir that if called upon he may give it, stating at the same time that since it was written circumstances have altered and that I wished to withdraw and alter it.

"McNeven tells me that Mackey says Angereau told him O'Connor had refused to be Chef D'Escadron. I suppose he thinks he has as good a right to be General as Tandy had, and he is dissatisfied at his disappointment.

"*Saturday, 24th.*—Before going out of town I called again on Dalton about some minor business and to lay before him a plan of descent on Ireland that had occurred to me. His objections to it make me doubt whether the Bayonne Army is for Ireland. He said 'be assured the French will never divide their force,' now if that army were going and another from Brest, they could scarcely avoid dividing them. I urged again the necessity of losing no time, he repeated the same assurance he had given me on the 18th and said the demonstrations are all made against England, but the object is Ireland, and added 'no camps are formed, but Brittany is full of troops, and in the time of Hoche, when we went to Brest there was not a man there but in twenty-

one days they were all collected in and we were under sail.' He hinted as he had done on the former occasion, that the Irish in Paris would be let stay quiet 'till the last moment and then hurried off. He said he repeated these assurances knowing how deeply I was interested, not only as an Irishman but as a brother, for I had told him last Sunday of my brother's arrest, and it is reported in today's *Argus*.

"*Thursday, October 20th.*—Swiney is returned from Cork in an open boat, he could not penetrate to Dublin, but committed his message to a confidential person who undertook to have it conveyed forward. The account he gives of the state of Ireland, as to persecution, is dreadful and the most vigorous police pervades the whole country. The spirit of the people, however, he says, is if possible more determined than ever. Vide his narrative. He has brought some statements respecting the forces in the South, which are mostly concentrated towards Cork, e. g. about five thousand in Cork, five thousand in Bandon, and three thousand about Bantry. This he says is the utmost, exclusive of yeomen. One seventy-four, and five or six frigates cruising off that station. The forts of Cork Harbour are miserably neglected, garrisoned entirely with invalids, as follows. *Camden* sixty men, twenty guns, 12 and 18 ^{Prs}. *Rams Head*, eighteen men, 4 to 8 guns, 6 and 12 ^{Prs}. *Spike island*, one hundred men, 30 to 40 guns, 12 ^{Prs}. *Cove* useless, thirty men, 10 guns, 24 ^{Prs}. He proposes a plan for putting all those and Cork into the hands of the French; but as secrecy is very necessary in all these things I shall only communicate it to some one authorised to hear it.

"Swiney has brought me the details of my dearest Robert's trial and execution. His conduct is my only consolation for his loss, but his speech as given by the English Government would be very offensive here. Dalton has been out of town ever since the date of my last, but as he is expected very shortly and matters do not press, I will wait for his return before I mention anything of Swiney to the Government.

"*Wednesday, November 2d.*—Saw Dalton for the first time since his return. I had different matters, relative to the release of some of my countrymen, to talk to him about, and a great deal to pull up that had run in arrears in his absence. I was curious to see whether there was any alteration in his manner, as my

brother's speech before sentence has been printed in the French papers and must have been displeasing to the government, but I could perceive no change in him. I told him the messenger was returned. Gave him some general statements relative to the state of the country and added that he had particular communications which might influence Government as to the plan of landing, which, however, for discretion's sake, I would not communicate until called upon by the Government and to some one appointed by it. This may give me a test of their intentions, as if I am not called on they can scarcely be serious.

"Friday, November 4th.—Called on Dalton again this morning in consequence of a communication from Genl. Angereau, which shows at least his desire to know everything about Ireland. I took the opportunity of asking how the preparations were going on. He said he had lately seen one from Brest. Trugnet was there and putting everything into the greatest activity, that there were twenty and odd sail of the line ready for sea, and that troops were gathering fast into the Department. Further than that they did not know themselves, as the greatest mystery was kept up respecting everything there. I had occasion to apply for permission to Connolly, who is in Portugal, to come to Paris, and he desired him to apply without delay to the French Minister there 'parce que le Portugal sera bientôt cassé.' I urged also the state of my countrymen who are here, and he comforted me with a repetition of the vague assurance so often given—'that a general measure would be shortly taken respecting them.'

"Sunday, November 13th.—In consequence of Dalton's desire I saw him this morning, he wished to communicate to me that the Irish would be attached à la suite de corps immediately and afterwards united into a corps, when the expedition was to take place. He showed me a list of the names and the order in which he had ranged them for commission. I reminded him of one or two he had forgotten. Before this conversation, there was a stranger and he in conversation about the probability of an expedition this winter, which the stranger denied, saying there were not above seven sail of the line ready in Brest. He answered, and I thought seemed embarrassed at my presence, that it was true there were not above eight sail actually ready, but there would be twenty in a very short time.

“*Tuesday, November 15th.*—In consequence of a rumour that the French had landed in Ireland, I called on my friend Dalton, but he says it is not possible. ‘It must have gone’ said he, ‘from Spain or the western coast of France; now we have not a soldier on the Spanish territory, and as to the western coasts I can assure you there are no troops as yet embarked.’

“*Thursday, November 17th.*—The rumour of an expedition for Ireland having sailed still gains ground, but principally among the Americans. Mr. [Joel] Barlow told me that he hears six of them have sailed from Bayonne, Carunna, Ferrol, Rochfort, Brest, and some other places. This is absurd, but a Mr. Livingston, a relative of the American Minister, assures me that one is on the point of sailing from Brest, that he knows there are twenty sail of the line ready there and has the strongest reason to believe that Massena set out for that place the day before yesterday. Others say that Massena is gone to Nice. At any rate I suspect the rumours are the consequence of something having transpired from the bureaux relative to the intention of Government.

“*Saturday, 19th.*—Encore des bruits. Every one says today that Angereau is landed in Ireland. I don’t believe a word of it, but I am unwell, and cannot go out. I am sure, however, that if it was true and known Dalton would have written me a note. Lawless also tells me, a friend of his who had opportunities of knowing, assured him that an expedition would very shortly sail from Brest and that the Irishmen in Paris would be hurried off suddenly; this corresponds with Dalton’s hint on the same subject.

“*Monday, December 6th.*—Saw Dalton this morning in consequence of a proposal I was desired to make to Government on the part of Thos. Read, for making an insurrection in the British Navy. Read, as I had previously learned, is very honest but cracked. He had made something of his proposal personally known thro’ another channel, so that I did not take Dalton un-awares. He said the measure proposed by Read could not be taken, as an exchange of prisoners must be made from the situation in which the two countries stand to one another. At any rate, said he, four months, the time mentioned by Read, are now too long. *The French Government will now very shortly do something, or not do it at all.* He mentioned that he had a personal conversation

with the first consul about Dowdal and his fellow travellers coming from Spain, and that the first consul desired to know would they take a destination without coming to Paris, on which I must write to them. I asked him confidentially, among friends, whether anything was to be done soon, he answered,—‘Oui, tenez-vous à cela,’ and after a little pause, ‘before four days,’ said he, ‘the Irishmen in Paris will get their orders to set off.’ I answered that tho’ I was glad they were provided for, it was not about that I was asking. ‘I know it is not,’ said he, ‘but about the expedition.’ He told me before the conversation began that some United Irishmen, whom he could not name, had let suspicion fall on their conduct by being too intimate with Englishmen. Perhaps, says he, their circumstances may have forced them; but we are going to provide on that, at any rate it is now of no great consequence as all the English are being sent away. I said I believed Mr. O’Connor, D’ McNeven and myself were perhaps more in the line than any other United Irishmen of seeing Englishmen. As to you, says he, all the English say that you are of all the United Irishmen the best intentioned for the liberty of his country, so much so as almost to make the Government look on you suspiciously. He said this with a half laugh, but query, are the French Government to look on every man suspiciously in proportion as he is well intended for the liberty of his country?

“I see by some letters on his table that O’Connor is in full confidence and procuring commissions in the new corps for men who were never United Irishmen, while the real United Irishmen are unprovided for. In the course of our conversation he suggested to me to give an account of Swiney’s mission and offered to translate it. I am sure he does it because he thinks matters are coming to a crisis. I shall set about it directly, but I sha’n’t ask him to translate it. I will do it myself and address it to the Minister at War.

“*Thursday, 8th.*—Dalton’s promise is out, the orders are this night issued for the Irish of the corps to go without delay to Morlaix and receive further orders from McSheehy. My letter to the Minister of War is not yet finished, writing French is a slow business.

“*Saturday, December 10th.*—Sent off my letter to the Minister

this morning, I took the opportunity of alluding to the language held by poor Robert [his brother] and all his friends, respecting the French and plainly stated the misfortunes that would follow if the French attempted to interfere in the internal affairs of Ireland, and pointed out what I thought ought to be their conduct. Vide the letter. I enclosed it to Dalton to deliver, but it is brought back with word that Dalton was this morning sent off in the utmost hurry on a mission; query to what place? As I could not go out myself McNeven has taken the letter to the Bureau de la Guerre to give strict charge that it may be put into the Minister's own hands. Harty has called here this evening; he says Dalton's mission is on that subject, but he will be back in a few days. The greatest activity, he says, is used and a great sudden exertion making; he says there are twenty-five thousand men at Brest and a General in Chief, under whose orders they are. The General is neither Massena, nor Bernadotte, but one, he says, that he prefers to either, having an honester character than Massena, and being a better general than Bernadotte, he made a considerable figure in the Army of Italy. Gen'l Harty says he is not at liberty to mention his name, but I will probably hear it in a few days. Harty says another Irish Battalion is going to be formed, which will I hope provide for the remainder of the Irish.

"Monday, December 12th.—Called on Gen'l Harty this morning and pressed some provision being made for enabling the Irish to travel to Morlaix. He said the application had been already made and would probably be granted, but he supposed not soon enough to be received before they set off. I will endeavour to enable the poorest of them to go. He mentioned again the formation of another battalion and hinted that those who did not show their devotion to the cause would be considered as English subjects and sent to Verdun. I mentioned to him that I wished to concert some mode of directing the mind of the First Consul, without making a formal requisition that by taking from him the merit of originating the measure would perhaps predispose him against it, to the dangers of the Irish holding his commissions if they should be taken. The Directory had suffered them to be executed and in so doing they acted weakly, but it would be more consistent with the known energy of his character to protect those who bore his commission. Harty did not think Bonaparte

would depart from what was the established custom in that respect, *as he did not know what insurrections might be raised against himself*. He would be probably unwilling to begin the example, that the French emigrant suffered in the same way and as long as our efforts could be considered a mere insurrection he did not believe any such step would be taken. I answered that I believed every liberal man thought the English and the coalesced powers ought to have protected the emigrants; that I asked no more than what France had done for the Americans, that if France did not think our insurrection lawful it ought not to profess to come and free us, that if it thought our attempt to throw off the English yoke lawful, it ought to protect us and consider us aliens to England. That what I would propose was that the First Consul should declare the Irish in France should be answerable for their bearing his commission, and I was certain the English would attempt nothing against us. That as to our efforts being considered as a mere insurrection it was in the Consul's power to remedy that by recognising our independence. I was aware of his unwillingness to recognise any particular government in Ireland, 'till his forces were there and properly supported, and therefore he would sign no treaty with me as the agent of my government, but I was willing to relieve him from that and make a sacrifice by proposing that he should conclude a simple recognition of the Independence of Ireland, with all the United Irishmen in France who were known to have been leaders and I would sign only as one of them, and in this treaty refer the details 'till a properly organized government should declare itself in Ireland and give powers to its Minister to treat with the French Republic. I repeated that I had thought on all this and could put it very strongly in a formal demand; but I would wish the idea to proceed from the First Consul if any mode could be devised for suggesting it to him. We were interrupted, but he promised me he would speak of it to the Minister of War next Wednesday.

"Saturday, January 21st, 1804.—I have for this sometime past too much neglected to continue these notes, but I will now endeavour to bring forward my arrears.

"Finding Genl. Harty did not speak to the Minister of War and that nothing effectual was likely to be done that way, I determined to prepare a memoir on the subject. I had spoken to him

of it on the 12th December. While I was occupied on that subject Mr. O'Reilly arrived from Ireland and brought me some extracts of my brother's speech, which completely contradicted the abuse he had been said to utter against the French. I therefore determined to lose no time in laying this before the Government, together with some details he had given me respecting the political and military situation of England and Ireland. When these were finished I gave them to the Minister thro' Harty and had some reason to perceive their good effects. My brother's speech gave very great satisfaction, it was printed in the *Moniteur*, *Argus* and every other paper, and was equally acceptable to the People and Government. I followed this by some further details respecting the military state of Ireland sent to me by Dowdall, who with three others had escaped to Spain. My memoir respecting the protection of the Irish officers and the Independence of Ireland was delayed by the translation and other causes, 'till—

“*Wednesday, Jan. 4th.*—I gave it to Dalton with a letter for the Minister at War. After having given it, I had reason to see that our affairs looked better. I got Swiney's arrears, some succours for individuals and a promise of more.

“*Wednesday, 18th.*—Finally Dalton delivered to me an answer to the Memoire promising that the first Consul had communicated it to the Minister at War, who had directed him to reduce it to writing. After he had done it, the Minister approved of it and desired him to inform me that he would confirm it to me by word of mouth whenever I pleased; for the detailed contents of the answer see itself. It promises every protection to the Irish officers and reprisals if any of them should not be treated as prisoners of war. It promises that the General commanding the expedition should have sealed letters by which he will be directed to publish on landing the First Consul's promise that he will not make peace without stipulating the independence of Ireland, if his forces shall be joined by a considerable body of Irish. It promises that Ireland shall be in every respect treated as was America in the war for its independence. In case of failure of the expedition it promises to all fugitive United Irishmen either places in the brigades or pensions. It expresses the First Consul's wish for the formation of a Committee and suggests that it might issue proclamations to make known those matters, which

should be inserted in the *Argus* and different journals of Europe. After I had read this Dalton mentioned that it was the First Consul's wish that Mr. O'Connor and I should be of that Committee and that he was instructed to make copy of that paper, leaving out the first sentence, for Mr. O'Connor. This proposal has embarrassed me more than I can well express; but one reason decided me. If at any time hereafter the promises which have been made us should be violated I would not leave it in anyone's power to blame me and say my pride or obstinacy frustrated the good intentions of the French Government. Besides, if, which I believe, the First Consul really means well towards Ireland, he is, however, of a character to have things only done in his own way, and I could be of no further use to Ireland if he took offence at my refusal. Dalton had signified that when the Committee was formed the Government would only communicate with it and thro' it, so that I determined to divest myself of my ambassadorial capacity with a good grace. I told him that with the feelings Mr. O'Connor and I had towards one another, I would never act along with him, if he and I were to be the Committee or the major part of it. But that if it were to be composed of such a number as that our passions and prejudices and differences would be lost in the cooler feelings of others, I would acquiesce. Dalton asked me who I thought would be fit members of such a Committee. I said H. Evans, Sweetman, McNevin, McDonnell, and Lawless. He said he had been desired to see Lewins, but had answered that no one had confidence in him and that he would be very unfit. He desired me to think on the subject and he would fix a time for my seeing the Minister, so we parted.

"I consulted Sweetman, who highly approved of my conduct and thought that as the Consul had required a Committee it could not be declined. But he started apprehensions about our property and an idea, which had forcibly impressed itself on me, that we and our proclamations might be used for the purpose of bullying England into peace and we agreed that we must try and keep clear of that rock. A letter I had received from McNeven tended to confirm that idea, he states as his opinion that matters are not in sufficient forwardness at Brest, that he hears there are but eight sail of the line equipped, that in six weeks there will be sixteen.

But he looks on six weeks as the ultimate limit of time this season. His suspicion was confirmed by Angereau wanting to get a person to go to Ireland and bring back *consignments*, which certainly could not be done in less time.

“With these impressions I went to the Minister’s by appointment this morning. Before I saw him I had a long conversation with Dalton. O’Connor offers to go into the Committee heart and hand. He has mentioned as fit members Chambers and McCormic. I believe he has also mentioned others not United Irishmen, or who are not known as such, and also H. Evans and Sweetman. I stated my fears to Dalton about the delay of the expedition and some of my reasons. He certainly did not seem to me very clear that the expedition would take place this season, but I could plainly see he had no idea it would be in even a month’s time. I stated my wish as an individual that my acting in that Committee should be sanctioned by the approbation of my countrymen at Morlaix. Against which he very strongly advised me as a friend, he would not wish me to do it. Even when Ambassadors are recognised they must in doing the business of their country, *conform themselves to the Genius of the Government near which they reside*. A delegation would do me no good and had never done me any and the confidence of Government in me resulted not from that but from my individual character, my services, suffering and the known devotion of my family to the cause of my country. The only argument which he used that had weight with me was that I had already had the suffrages of my countrymen to act even alone with the French Government, *à fortiori*, I had it to my being one of a committee when that Government chose to act by such an organ. At length I saw the Minister, who confirmed to me every part of the Consul’s answer to my Memoir. I expressed all my gratitude for the communication, that with regard to the committee there were some circumstances probably unknown to the First Consul, that ought to be considered. Almost every one of those who might be deemed eligible for that committee had their property in the hands of the English Government, which would undoubtedly confiscate all, and as most of us were fathers of families it was natural we should look to our families. He interrupted me by saying it was not intended to expose us to any risk. The names of the com-

mittee might be kept secret and the necessary proclamations published without names, that our countrymen would still give credit to them. That in short we could act as we chose for these objects, but the First Consul wished a body to which he could adapt himself and that would combine all interests and keep up the necessary communications with Ireland. I answered that the conduct of those who might go into the committee would be very much regulated by the knowledge of what state affairs were in. If matters were near the point men would naturally run such risks as they would not feel warranted in doing if the crisis were remote. He said, 'we can't tell you the secrets of the Government'; and after an instant's hesitation, 'it is the intention of Government to do it in six weeks. I do not say it will be done then because I can't answer for the weather, but everything will be ready and the English expedition will also be ready then.' He pressed the forming of the committee, saying—'fix among yourselves upon the proper persons, I suppose five will be enough, and when you are agreed you can take such steps for your own security as you may think fit.' 'Mr. O'Connor and you need have no difference; your lines are not the same, he is military and *has been always in that line*, you are for the civil administration. He desires to act in *the way he has been accustomed to and it will put him at the head of the Irish Troops*.' 'He says he does not know whether he has their confidence, if he has not, will put another in his place.' So that all my suspicions are confirmed, and my friends must act with great circumspection.

"The Minister also mentioned Lewins, but instantly said, 'He is not trusted by any of you, and would be unfit.' He expressed a wish to get some one to go to Ireland to communicate the substance at least of the Consul's answer to me. I observed that when speaking on the subject of the time of the expedition going and the possibility of its being delayed, he did not confine himself within the limits of that answer, but went the length of his former assurance,—'it is the intention of the First Consul not to make peace 'till the independence of Ireland is recognised.' At the conclusion he requested me to give him my own ideas of the best place for debarkation and the number of forces that would suffice and when the committee was formed he would wish for theirs. I speaking of the possible number of that Committee, which I said

ought to be more than five, Dalton said to me, 'I have a person to propose to the Minister whom you do not know, but whose respectability will I am sure secure your approbation.' On my looking inquisitive, he said he could not communicate his name 'till he had obtained his permission. If I conjecture right he is a man very unfit, because not of our principles and I suspect foisted in by O'Connor.

"When I returned home I met McDonnell just returning from the country and shewed him the First Consul's answer, &c. He agreed that a Committee must be formed, as it is asked for, and I believe he will consent to be one. Sweetman also called on me, Evans has refused; he disapproves of the Committee and is not sufficiently polite to bend to the First Consul's wishes. He says it can do no good that is not done. All Europe knows the state of Ireland, and it wants no preparations from a Committee. He is not far wrong, but it would be very culpable in me to object to its formation on that ground. He suspects it is some trap and meant to deceive us, if deception be intended I ought doubly to wish for its formation, both the better to see into and counteract the deception and to relieve myself from the entire responsibility of being a dupe and the instrument of deceiving my country.

"Sweetman proposes procuring a person to send over to have our properties secured by our friends, and who might perhaps also be the bearer of any political message; I will see him to-morrow.

"*Tuesday, February 7th.*—As on the last occasion, I have a considerable arrears to pull up. Sweetman failed entirely in procuring the person he counted on for going to Ireland and no one seems very anxious to hurry the formation of the Committee except the Government, whose agents spoke of it several times. The reluctance on my part arose from the notions already mentioned, from a growing conviction that no immediate expedition would take place, and from perceiving O'Connor's efforts for gradually setting aside those I have named and slipping in persons of his own nomination. The present fears of peace are very much done away by the failure of the American offers of mediation and by the personal animosity which prevails between the two governments, but the other reasons for declining the Committee become every day stronger. In the meanwhile I

presented to the Minister the plan of operations that seemed to me best calculated for Ireland and shortly after Gen'l Donzelot, Chef D'Etat major du Camp de Brest, requested an interview with me in which we had a very detailed conversation. Every time I saw Dalton some sounding conversation arose about the Committee, in which he either stated some objection against some one of those I had originally mentioned, such as—'presque McNeven est là bas nous l'y laisserons, il pourra nous y être utile,' or else he asked me would not Chambers be a good man, or Sampson, tho' he was a great egotist and vain, yet he had connections and fortune, or Arthur McMahon, who might act as Secretary. Apropos of this last, I believe him very honest and that O'Connor would be mistaken in his subserviency, but the reason he was mentioned I am convinced was that he had been obliged to lay himself under some pecuniary obligation to O'Connor. Dalton also said that the objection respecting the danger to our families and properties might be removed by mutually giving an oath of secrecy. But I had seen enough to convince me that no Committee was necessary and that no proper one would be formed, and that no blame might fall on me for thwarting it prematurely I quietly let matters take their course 'till this morning. I had occasion to see Dalton on a very secret and important subject, which he said was an additional motive for forming the Committee. I then asked him whom Government had in contemplation to place on it, he said O'Connor and myself, Sweetman, Chambers, Sampson, another gentleman whom he named of his own friends, and who if he was ever an United Irishman and a republican would be very proper, and finally Arthur McMahon. I then said that I had many observations to make on that subject whenever was the proper time; he said to make them now. I then went on and observed that when I had consented to go into a Committee with Mr. O'Connor, I did it under the impression that an expedition was on the point of sailing and that a proclamation and provisional measures were urgently wanting. Under that impression I was willing to make great sacrifices which I could not so readily do under my present conviction that no expedition was speedily intended, and that the Committee would only be occupied about things of which I could not see the end, nature, or object. Dalton said he had observed

to the Minister the other day that there would be a great deal of difficulty in forming a Committee; observe this was the first time I had appeared to make any, and that men would not willingly risk their fortunes in an affair '*qui pourrait trainer.*' I said that was unquestionably true and objection against forming any Committee; but that further I must observe that when I consented to be one I said provided it was composed of independent men and that any consequences of Mr. O'Connor and my personal feelings might be lost in the independence of the rest. I had mentioned some on whom I was convinced the choice of the United Irishmen would fall if they were to choose. They had all been set aside one by one, as I was sure on Mr. O'Connor's objections and others mentioned, as I was equally sure on his suggestion. I then asked him if it was not Mr. O'Connor who had named Chambers, Sampson & McMahon, he said it certainly was, and, either said himself, or repeated O'Connor's expression of them, which I think was the fact '*qu'ils seraient assez nuls.*' I said I was very certain Mr. O'Connor objected to those of my naming, because he knew they would not be his instruments, and he proposed the others hoping, whether truly or falsely, that he might make them so; that for my part I would never consent to lend whatever name or character I had to the acts of himself and his instruments. I begged it therefore to be expressly understood that tho' I saw no use of the Committee in the present state of things, yet I gave it no opposition, but reserved to myself the right of withdrawing myself from it if it should consist of such men as should not be selected out of the United Irishmen in France, and as would not be chosen by the United Irishmen in France or Ireland, if they were permitted to make an election. I forgot to state that both McNeven and Swiney had written to me against going into any Committee with O'Connor, and stated that to be the opinion of their friends at Morlaix.

"*Saturday, Feb. 17th.*—I had today occasion to have another interview with Dalton on a subject which I cannot well commit to paper. But I am more and more convinced that it is not intended to do anything speedily for Ireland, which would if possible indispose me more than I was to the projected committee; but in truth all idea of that seems past as will appear by the following conversation. Dalton told me he had been last Sunday

at Malmaison, at a ball of Madame Bonaparte, that the Chief Consul had taken him aside and talked to him a great deal about me, that he expressed great anxiety that Mr. O'Connor and I should be brought together and to act together. Thinking this alluded to the Committee, I began to repeat what I had before said, that if a sufficient number of really independent men could be brought together, I should not oppose it, but he interrupted me and said it was not a committee the Consul alluded to, but that *we two* should act together without any committee. I instantly replied that was what I never would do and asked what necessity was there for the measure, had we been giving different advices and opinions? He said, no, on the contrary we agreed in all our suggestions; I then said there could be no reason for doing what, if I did, I should hold myself criminally responsible to my country. For I took the opportunity of alluding to what the Minister said were the intentions of the French, to put O'Connor at the head of the Irish Army on landing, and I said the Government must have been grossly deceived if it believed him a Military man. Who had told them so? I affirmed it was not the fact, and that he had never seen any service or array of troops, nor was he qualified for any such station. His answer was most remarkable: 'The French you know have sometimes a singular and eccentric way of accomplishing their objects, and perhaps they would prefer placing in that situation a man who knows nothing, so would let himself be directed, than one who might take advantage of his military knowledge and not be so much under orders.' 'Au reste,' says he, 'the Government wont be deceived.' If they think O'Connor will be under orders from diffidence of himself and his knowledge, they are grossly deceived, if they think he will let himself be at their orders from other motives they may know him about as well as I do.

Thursday, March 1st.—In consequence of a paragraph which has appeared in yesterday's *Argus*, attacking the United Irishmen and one of their fundamental principles, religious liberty, and their formally maintaining the necessity of a Catholic Establishment in Ireland, I have prepared a very strong letter to the Ministry requiring its being disavowed as speaking the sentiment of Government, and if that should not be complied with, withdrawing from all further connection with Government.

“Indeed I have many accounts to be dissatisfied. I wrote to the Minister at War the 22nd of February on the subject alluded to in my last as one I ought not to commit to paper, but which is really of great importance and requires a very prompt decision; it has been dragging on this month and that letter was to hurry their decision, but I have yet received no answer. The manner in which the appointments have been made at Morlaix show that they were made by O'Connor's influence under cover of McSheehy's discretion and I understand is to have some great military command, far out of proportion to the others, and all is kept a secret from me, who have not been at all consulted.

“*Saturday, March 3d.*—Delaney has not yet translated my letter to the Minister, and the delay vexes me exceedingly; but what vexes me still more and astonishes me above measure, is that O'Connor is appointed a General of Division, and is to set off in fifteen days for Brest! He says that he has the First Consul's promise that when they land in Ireland, Angereau will yield the command to him, is that possible? I am to dine at Angereau's tomorrow where he is to be. O'Connor is to make McSheehy head of his staff, that accounts for the appointments at Morlaix. O'Connor is going on rapidly to the object I know he aims at, being First Consul in Ireland, but I hope my countrymen will have spirit and virtue to prevent him.

“*Monday, March 5th.*—I gave in my letter to Lesperat, Berthier's Secretary, yesterday morning and he says he is sure the answer will be favourable. I dined yesterday at Angereau's where I certainly was received with every mark of distinction and politeness. O'Connor was there and he had the impudence to come up and speak to me, but I answered him very coldly. I mentioned to Angereau in conversation that the season for the expedition seemed passed. He said not and that all the sea officers said we had yet 'till the end of April. I put him in mind of the little Naval preparation at Brest. He said he had himself seen sixteen sail of the line ready and in ten days there would be twenty-one. That they would sail from different ports and in short would have enough for transporting thirty thousand men. I objected to the crews as not being sailors; he confessed they were not experienced, but they were practising every day and the officers were good. All this indeed McNeven's letter from

Brest itself confirms. He spoke in the warmest terms of Ireland and assured me everything would be so conducted as to give the people the utmost satisfaction. Trugnet and Donzelot, were also there, and all speak of the expedition as immediately to take place, and they are all going down to Brest without delay. But I do not believe they are so near sailing, indeed Trugnet in conversation with me admitted the probability that the King's illness might bring about peace and prevent it. Harty has called on me this morning, he was at the Consul's yesterday, who personally told him he would get his orders for going to Brest directly, and asked him abruptly if O'Connor and I were agreed yet. He said the question embarrassed him but he answered we were 'd'accord au fond sur nos affaires,' which I am sure is not the fact. He says Angereau has great consideration for me and the Consul, &c. I suppose to make O'Connor's appointment palatable to me. He says that if I had chosen a military line, I would have had as high and that I am as much thought of; perhaps so, but not as much listened to, nor as respectfully treated, as may be seen by the Minister not condescending to answer my applications; will see what the last will do, it's rather a tartar.

"*Saturday, March 10th, 1804.*—This day's *Argus* contains an article that may be considered as coming from the orders of Government in consequence of my remonstrance and disavowing the former publication as speaking the language of Government. So far it is satisfactory, but it is very dryly so and further if it proceeds from Government I am treated very cavalierly, for no communication or message direct or indirect has been made to me, nor any apparent notice taken of my letter.

"I shall therefore avoid doing anything and keep myself in the background unless Government chooses to show me some little civility and to convince me that they wish for the continuance of my communications."

This diary of Mr. Emmet was contained in three parts, evidently home-made, by stitching together a number of sheets small enough in size to be carried in a coat-pocket. The manuscript we have given was very closely written and ends abruptly, leaving several blank pages at the back of the third part which

would have been utilized in all probability if the record had been continued during the following six months of Mr. Emmet's residence in Paris. It is to be regretted that we are left in ignorance of the cause, or final affront from the French Government, which compelled Mr. Emmet to give up his position and leave France during the following October to settle in the United States.

INDEX

A

- Abercrombie, Sir Ralph, resigns his command, i., 201; letter of, to Dundas, ii., 221
- Absentee landlords, i., 235, 297, 304; remittances to a drain upon Ireland, ii., 23, 24, 29, 37, 69, 130, 131, 164
- Absenteeism, evils of, i., 243; ii., 51, 105, 106, 108; increased by the Union, i., 235, 246
- Act of 1817, passed, ii., 58
- Act of Oblivion, applied only to Irish Protestants, i., 88, 89
- Act of the Legislative Union, *see* Union.
- Adams, Judge, white gloves presented to, ii., 183
- Adler, Mr., on tolerance of Irish Catholics, i., 116
- Adrian IV., Pope, election of, i., 50; grants Bull to Henry II., i., 45-47; ii., 191, 192, 194; genuineness of Bull questioned, i., 45, 47-51, 54, 55, 57, 59
- "Adventurers for the work of reducing the Kingdom of Ireland," English Company of, i., 79
- Advocate's Library, *see* Edinburgh.
- Agrarian troubles in Ireland, ii., 93, 140-143, 148, 149; *see also* Land.
- Agricultural conditions, in England and Scotland, ii., 214; in Ireland, i., 235; ii., 51, 67-69, 87-89, 164, 165; statistics relating to, ii., 107, 108
- Agricultural Organization Society, ii., 148, 149
- Agricultural, productions of Ireland, earliest legislation against, ii., 6; yearly value of, ii., 102-108; purposes, report of land available for, ii., 67, 68
- Albinus, i., 20
- Aldhelm, i., 33
- Alexander III., Pope, Bull of, i., 51-55, 58
- Alfred the Great, founder of Oxford University, i., 31, 43
- Algerine Act, the, effect of, ii., 165
- Almshouses, a curse to Ireland, i., 302, 303; ii., 117
- Ambrosian Library, *see* Milan.
- America, Irish navigators discover, i., 27, 28, 40; prosperity of, i., 215; Irish emigrants to, i., 126, 264, 270, 306, 308, 316, 317; ii., 143; pecuniary aid for Ireland from, i., 298, 299, 321, 322; ii., 103, 108, 136; Irish exports to, ii., 9, 24, 25
- American Colonies, Irish prisoners sold in, i., 101-104; Irish emigrants to, i., 126; ii., 87
- American Revolution, the, i., 114, 119, 138, 201, 209, 214, 248; ii., 21, 87, 173
- Anderson, Mr., on commerce, ii., 3
- Andrews, Judge, *see* Assizes.
- Anglo-Irish Government, treaty between the United Irishmen and, i., 168
- Anglo-Saxon students flock to Ireland as educational centre, i., 33, 39
- Anjou, lost to the English, i., 278
- Annals and chronicles of Ireland, antiquity and exactness of, i., 17-22, 28
- Annals of Ulster, the, i., 19
- Anne, Queen, obligations of Treaty of Limerick ignored by, i., 112; penal laws against Irish Catholics in reign of, i., 114; the Union proposed in reign of, i., 236
- Annual Register*, the, cited, ii., 107
- "Anti-popery Bill," the, of 1704, i., 125
- Antrim, County of, proportion of religious denominations in, i., 287; Nationalist strength of, i., 289; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294, 303; Scotch-Irish in, ii., 213

- Aquitaine, Eleanor of, i., 52
 Arable lands of Ireland, *see* Land.
 Arbitration Treaty, the, effect of Irish influence upon, ii., 173
 Arcadia, the exiles of, i., 103, 104
 Archives, Irish Government, i., 265
 Arklow, battle of, i., 203
 Armagh, first Christian school established in, i., 28; the metropolis of civilization, i., 30; Irish missionaries of, i., 31; Gelarius of, i., 57; first Ulster regiment assembled at, i., 118; the assizes of, i., 163, 164; description of, ii., 1, 2
 Armagh, County of, i., 109; troubles in, i., 164, 165; Catholics forcibly expelled from, i., 167; religious denominations in, i., 287, 325, 330; Nationalist strength of, i., 289; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294; escheated lands of, ii., 125
 Armenians, the, massacre of, ii., 67
 Arms Acts, the, i., 273, 274, 281
 Armstrong, —, informer, i., 192
 Armstrong, Captain, cruel orders of, i., 199
 Arnold, Matthew, on the penal code, ii., 82
 Articles of Limerick, i., 213
 Articles of the Scotch Union, i., 213
 Ashbourne Acts, the, value of, ii., 158
 Assizes, Quarterly, criminal record of, in "proclaimed" counties of Ireland, ii., 184-189
 Athletic sports in Ireland, i., 37
 Athlone, Castle of, i., 73, 74
 Athunree, battle of, i., 61
 Atkinson, John, vindication of the Government by, i., 324; on jury-packing, ii., 219
A True Relation of the Proceedings of the Scots and English Forces in the North of Ireland in 1642, burned by order of Parliament, i., 89
 Australia, i., 282, 331; ii., 115, 182
 Austria-Hungary, ii., 83
 Authors, Irish, treatment of works by, i., 5, 6, 36, 88, 89, 107; on extermination of Catholics, i., 107
 i., 283, 284; achievements of, in Ireland, ii., 155-158
 Baltimore, Lord, i., 71
 Baltimore (Baile-tig-mor), Ireland, poverty of village of, ii., 15, 16
 Bantry, i., 67
 Bantry Bay, the French enter, i., 159
 Barbadoes, the, i., 92, 93, 102
 Barbour, Sir David, ii., 53
 Bardin, —, cited, ii., 27
 Barlow, Stephen, on bribery in behalf of the Union, i., 239; on woollen industries, ii., 11, 12
 Barontius, —, on Henry II., i., 53
 Barrington, Sir Jonah, on passage of the Union Bill through Irish Parliament, i., 206, 225-229, 231, 232, 246; on prosperity of Ireland under Home Rule, ii., 21; the "Black List" compiled by, ii., 227-234
 Barry, Colonel, i., 217
 Barton, Judge, *see* Assizes.
 "Battalion of Testimony," the, maintained at police centres, i., 172, 174, 180; trained, i., 189, 267
 Battersby, W. J., on history of the Union, i., 235-246, 248-251; on destruction of Irish industries, ii., 9, 23-27; on financial condition of Ireland, ii., 23, 31-38, 163-166; on injustice of Irish representation in Parliament, ii., 238
 Becket, Thomas à, Archbishop of Canterbury, murder of, i., 48, 52-55; ii., 191
 Bede, the Venerable, i., 20; on Ireland as an educational centre, i., 33
 Bedell, —, i., 115
 Beecher, Colonel, plunder of, i., 96
 Belfast, first organization of United Irishmen at, i., 126, 133; delegates from, to "Volunteer Convention," i., 130; petitions for repeal of restrictive laws against Catholics, i., 141, 144; riots in, i., 176, 185; Protestant intolerance in, i., 330; ii., 223; Presbyterian university at, ii., 75
 Belfast, West, Nationalist spirit of, i., 289
 Belgium, solution of Land Question in, ii., 139, 140
 Belmore, Lord, ii., 133
 "Beresford Faction," the, i., 148
 Beresford, John Claudius, Riding-School of, i., 179, 217
 Beresford, Marcus, dismissal and restoration of, i., 148, 149, 151, 152

B

- Bagenal, Philip H. D., on Land League movement, ii., 136-143
 Bagwell, Mr., i., 217
 Balbriggan, manufactures of, ii., 28
 Balfour, Arthur J., prompt action of,

- Bessborough Commission, the, report of, ii., 244
- Betham, Sir William, i., 17
- Bigotry in Ireland, *see* Catholics and Orangemen.
- Bill, Expiring Laws Continuation, i., 272
- Bill for Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, i., 216, 224, 227, 228
- Bill for raising money for bribery i., 225
- Births, proportion of, in Ireland, ii., 51
- "Black List," the, list of voters for the Union, i., 231; ii., 227-233
- Blake, Edward, on financial relations of Great Britain and Ireland, ii., 49-55
- Blindness, proportion of, in Ireland, i., 307, 308; ii., 51
- Blois, Pierre de, i., 48
- Bloomfield, i., 264
- Board of Trade, report of, ii., 242, 243
- Bobio, Monastery of, founded by Columbanus, i., 36
- Bodleian Library, the, Irish MSS. in, i., 36
- Boers, the, ii., 45, 72, 146, 147, 176, 181, 219
- Bog lands of Ireland, *see* Land.
- Bond, Oliver, arrest of, i., 192
- Bonneville, ———, Emmet's interviews with, ii., 296, 298, 299, 303
- Books, Irish, destroyed by order of British Government, i., 6, 89
- Book-trade in Ireland, ii., 24
- Borlace, Edmund, on English methods of extermination of Irish, i., 93-96, 104
- Boroughs, Irish, conditions in, i., 291
- Boston, i., 321
- Boston Pilot*, the, ii., 18
- Boyne, battle of the, i., 110, 177, 178
- Boyne Water*, Orange ballad, i., 331
- Brehon Laws, the, origin of, i., 22, 23; character of, i., 24, 25, 254; translation and publication of, i., 23; afford knowledge of Irish manners and customs, i., 26; system of, abolished by James I., i., 26
- Brehons, the, duties of, i., 23, 314
- Brennan, Dr. William, poem by, on the Union, i., 230, 231
- Brewing industries of Ireland, the, ii., 5, 7, 12, 17, 43, 61, 63
- Brian Boru, changes made in Brehon Laws by, i., 26
- Bribery, use of, to gain votes for the Union, i., 225, 226, 239, 240, 244, 245, 248; ii., 227-233
- Bridges, Dr., on tithes, i., 131
- Bright, John, on character of Irish, i., 9; on evictions, ii., 99; amends land bill, ii., 156; letter of Mr. Daunt to, ii., 166-169
- British Army, proportion of Irish soldiers in, ii., 29, 60, 238-240
- British Cabinet, Irish policy of, known in France, i., 168; Irish Parliament in pay of, i., 122
- British Colonies, Irish emigration to, ii., 173
- British Constitution, *see* Constitution.
- British Empire, the possible overthrow of, i., 11; ii., 154, 170; prosperity of Ireland an advantage to, ii., 162
- British Government, detestable Irish policy of, i., xii., xiii., 5, 9-12, 32, 122, 203, 210, 221-223, 274, 282, 297-299, 322, 323; ii., 4, 70, 73, 100, 104, 120, 129, 140, 143, 153, 154, 163, 172, 178, 179, 185, 189; carries on war of extermination against Irish Catholics, i., 66, 71, 72, 76-90, 100, 101, 107-109, 114, 314, 318; ii., 4, 5, 85, 86, 110, 120, 129, 191-194, 198, 222; sanctions system of false witnesses and packed juries in Ireland, i., 8, 168, 170, 171, 174, 189, 266, 267; ii., 218-220; Irish industries destroyed by legislative acts of, i., 106-108, 125; ii., 4-17, 20, 24-30, 66, 78, 79, 88, 89, 106, 135, 157, 164; disregards pledged faith, i., xii., 112, 158, 204-206, 213, 227-229, 251-253, 283; ii., 27, 33, 158, 179, 192-194; incites Irish to rebellion to bring about the Union, i., 112, 114, 122, 158-160, 168, 177, 191, 194, 200, 215, 224, 235-237, 239, 258, 262, 264, 265, 270; ii., 23, 110, 221; grants concessions to Ireland, i., 119, 136, 138; ii., 22, 23; recognizes Ireland as a distinct kingdom, i., 119, 120, 127-129, 158, 222, 228, 229, 232, 248; ii., 20, 21, 25, 46, 66; incites religious animosities in Ireland, i., 131-135, 143-147, 149-152, 165, 183, 193, 194; ii., 221, 222; attempts of, to weaken influence of United Irishmen, i., 135, 136; charges against, by leaders of

British Government,—*Continued.*

United Irishmen, i., 157 *et seq.*; responsible for atrocities committed by Orangemen, i., 165, 166, 183, 185, 195, 204, 208; ii., 222; use of spies and informers in Ireland by, i., 188-192, 194, 206, 260-262; Catholic Emancipation granted by, *see* Catholic; Penal laws against Irish Catholics enacted by, *see* Catholics; proposed benefits to Ireland from Union, *see* Union; secret records of, i., 256; responsible for outbreak of 1803, i., 259-263; responsible for death of Robert Emmet, i., 259, 261-263, 265; issues official version of Emmet's trial and execution, i., 268-270; excessive rate of taxes levied on Ireland by, i., 297; ii., 31-48, 50-65; responsible for horrors of Irish famine, i., 297, 298, 306, 312, 313, 315, 316; hated by the Irish, i., 129, 305, 312; ii., 86, 99, 100; action of, in regard to Davis Industrial School, ii., 16; publishes statistics showing prosperity of Ireland, ii., 67, 68; agrarian problems to be solved by, for relief of Ireland, ii., 108-111; favors landlord interests, ii., 128; efforts of, to conciliate Ireland, ii., 144, 163; method of settling Scotch Crofters' troubles, ii., 154; suspends trial by jury in part of Ireland, ii., 184, 188, 189; controls Irish Press, ii., 190; action of, relating to Irish universities, ii., 73-75, 77, 82, 83, 116, 196

British Museum, Irish MSS. in, i., 36

British Navy, Irishmen impressed into, i., 162; proportion of Irishmen in, ii., 29, 239; powerful, ii., 176, 177

British Relief Association, i., 299

Bronze work, Irish, excellence of, ii., 1

Broudine, Friar Anthony, on surrender of Drogheda, i., 93

Brougham, Lord, denounces Coercion Acts, i., 275

Bruce, Edward, King of Ireland, i., 61; ii., 194

Bruce, Robert, i., 61

Bull of Adrian IV. to Henry II., i., 45-51, 54, 57, 59; ii., 191, 192

Bull of Alexander III., i., 51-55

Bullarium Romanum, i., 57, 58

Burdett-Connis, Baroness, aids village of Baltimore, ii., 15, 16

Burgo, Richard de, Irish lands of, descend to English Crown, i., 74

Burke, Sir Bernard, Emmet papers in custody of, i., 257-259, 261-263; ii., 227

Burke, Edmund, on Penal Code of Ireland, i., 136, 137, 139, 148; on Catholic persecution, ii., 77, 80-84, 168

Butler's *Analogy*, ii., 25

Butt, Isaac, his *The Irish People and the Irish Land*, cited, i., 14, 15; on government of Ireland, ii., 84; on Irish land question, ii., 93-96, 115-124, 126-135

Butter and cheese, Irish exportation of, prohibited, ii., 8

C

Caird, Sir James, i., 291

Cairnes, Professor, on Irish evictions, cited by Fox, ii., 97-100

Calcutta, Black Hole of, emigrant ships compared to, i., 317

Cambrensis, Giraldus, cited, i., 50, 52, 54, 57

Cambridge, University of, i., 43

Camden, Lord, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, i., 151-153, 158; cruel administration of, i., 173, 177, 197

Campion, Edmund, on education in Ireland, i., 105; on use of linen in Ireland, ii., 4

Canada, i., 282, 331; ii., 115; Irish emigrants to, i., 308

Canterbury, Theobald, Archbishop of, i., 57; Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of, i., 48, 52, 53, 55; ii., 191

Carew, ———, English general, i., 66

Carey, Mathew, on Irish confiscations, i., 79; on war of extermination in Ireland, i., 91, 94, 107, 108

Carhampton, Lord, brutality of, i., 161, 162

Carlingford, garrison of, put to the sword, i., 94

Carlisle, Lord, Lord Fitzwilliam's letters to, i., 147; speech of, cited, i., 316

Carlow, County of, license of troops in, i., 199

Carnegie Hall, Davitt's speech at, ii., 160

Carnot, Director, i., 168

Carpet industry of Ireland, ii., 25

Carraroe, evictions at, ii., 96

Carrickfergus, County of the town of, i., 288

- Carrigmain, Castle of, put to the sword, i., 88
- Carrisfergus, i., 82
- Carte, Thomas, on title to Irish lands, i., 73; on extirpation of Irish Catholics, i., 77, 78, 85, 86; cites case of Sir William Petty, i., 172; on unwise policy of England, i., 278; on Ulster Grants, ii., 126, 127
- Cashel, i., 68, 94, 95, 131
- Casino, home of the Emmet family, i., 264
- "Castle" Government, the, corrupt extravagance of, ii., 47; *see* Dublin Castle.
- Castlebar, migratory harvesters from, ii., 245
- Castlereagh, migratory harvesters from, ii., 245
- Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Lord, reply of, to O'Connor, i., 194, 195; character of, i., 206; compared to Robespierre, i., 207; Parliament bribed by, i., 225, 231-233, 239, 240; ii., 233; bill for Union introduced by, i., 227, 228; arraignment of, i., 237, 238; advocates the Union, i., 241, 242, 246; stirs up Irish rebellion, i., 261, 262; plan of, for Irish taxation, ii., 33, 34, 40, 57
- Catalonia, Irish woollens in, ii., 3
- Cathedrals, ruins of Irish, ii., 1
- Cathire More, King of Leinster, i., 37
- Catholic Association of Ireland, growth of, i., 138
- Catholic Church in Ireland, condition of, under Adrian IV., i., 46-48, 53, 55
- Catholic clergy, persecution of Irish, i., 69, 70, 136, 139; ii., 181, 192
- Catholic constituencies represented by Protestant members of Parliament, i., 175, 176
- Catholic Convention, in behalf of religious freedom, i., 144
- Catholic Emancipation, hopes of Irish for, i., 132, 148, 232; ii., 100; promised, i., 138, 149, 204, 206, 238, 252
- Catholic Emancipation Act, passage of, i., 139, 142, 143, 204, 252, 280, 286, 323; ii., 58, 114
- Catholics, Irish, plan for extermination of, *see* British Government; persecution and sufferings of, i., 13, 69, 70, 79, 83-90, 107, 109, 114, 129-131, 136, 139, 161, 162, 165, 166, 169, 186, 204, 312, 313, 323, 324, 328, 329, 332, 333; ii., 5, 80-84, 93, 95, 181, 191-210, 222; dispossessed of lands, *see* Confiscation; proportion of, in Ireland, i., 74, 129, 325, 328; ii., 75; proportion of, in Ulster, i., 121-123, 125-128, 131, 286-289; Remonstrance of, to Crown Commissioners, i., 78, 90; ii., 195-210; Penal laws enacted against, *see* Ireland and Penal Code; treaty between William and Mary and, i., 110, 111; tolerant spirit of, i., 78, 114-116, 122, 126, 175, 176, 323, 331, 332; ii., 222, 223; driven from Ulster, i., 123; ii., 87; driven from Armagh, i., 166, 167; proportion of, in Irish outbreaks, i., 129, 130; good feeling between Irish Protestants and, i., 130, 131, 141, 143, 144, 165; public worship of, legalized, i., 138; enabled to take Oath of Allegiance, i., 138; educational restrictions placed upon, i., 136, 139, 323; ii., 73-78, 80-83, 159, 196, 218; exclusion of, from offices and professions, i., 139, 140, 170, 216, 247, 252, 286, 323-325, 328-332; ii., 81, 82; persecution of, by Orangemen, i., 165, 166, 176, 177, 183, 196-200; ii., 75, 165; few, in societies of United Irishmen, i., 196-198; jury-packing in cases against, *see* Jury; no sympathy with France, i., 197, 198; emigration of, from Ireland, i., 287, 316-320, 328; ii., 87, 88, 98-100; not properly aided during famine, i., 302; simple equality desired by, i., 331; ii., 76; university refused to, by Parliament, ii., 73-75, 77; right of, to a university, ii., 82, 83; Trinity College established by, ii., 74; taxed for maintenance of Protestant schools, ii., 76-78
- Cattle raising in Ireland profitable, i., 299; ii., 86, 87
- Cattle trade of Ireland prohibited, ii., 8, 78
- Cavan, County of, disturbances in, i., 145; religious denominations in, i., 288; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294; escheated lands of, ii., 125, 146; "proclaimed," ii., 185; criminal record of, ii., 185, 186
- Caxton, William, *The Game and Playe of the Chesse*, first book printed by, i., 38

- Celestine, Pope, ii., 191
 Celestius, i., 20
 Celtic language, the, antiquity of, i., 22
 Celtic race, the, i., 32; ii., 70, 120
Celtic Tongue, The, poem, cited, i., 40-42
Celts and Saxons, poem, cited, i., 13
 Census reports of Ireland, i., 306, 307, 320; ii., 67, 68
 Ceylon, ii., 77
 Chamberlain, Joseph, i., 176; ii., 156
 Chambers, —, ii., 260
 Charlemont, Lord, i., 118
 Charles I., King, reign of, i., 62, 72-78, 97, 197; responsible for rebellion of 1641, i., 76; ii., 87; character of, i., 76; proposed marriage of, while Prince, i., 70, 71; appoints commission to hear grievances of Irish Catholics, i., 90; Irish policy of, ii., 5, 79, 129; Remonstrance of Irish Catholics to, ii., 195-210
 Charles II., King, i., 109, 110; ii., 130
 Charleston, i., 201
 Charter Schools, established in Ireland, i., 242, 244; ii., 216, 217
 Chartres, John of Salisbury, Bishop of, i., 48
 Chepstow, Richard of, i., 50
 Chess, early national game of Ireland, i., 37, 38
 Chester, i., 101; Irish linen imported into, ii., 3
 Chichester, Sir Arthur, i., 68
 Childers, Mr., ii., 53
 Cholera, *see* Diseases.
 Christian of Lismore, i., 57
 Christianity, introduction of, into Ireland, i., 20, 26, 28, 236; ii., 191; spread by Irish Missionaries, i., 27
 Chronicles, early Irish, *see* Annals.
 Church of England, the, ascendancy of, maintained in Ireland, i., 114; *see* also Established Church.
 Church of Ireland (Protestant), Disestablished, i., 326; ii., 75, 113
 Circuits, judicial, i., 173; ii., 183
 Clan system in Ireland, i., 62
 Clancy, J. J., on overtaxation of Ireland, ii., 56, 58, 59; motion of, ii., 67
 Clanmorris, Lord, bribery of, i., 226
 Clanrickard, Earl of, Governor of Galway, i., 83, 86, 87; ii., 210
 Clare, County of, number of Catholics in, i., 198; sheep raising in, ii., 9; bog lands in, ii., 103; criminal record of, ii., 185, 186, 189
 Clare, John Fitzgibbon, Earl of, efforts of, to bring about the Union, i., 165, 232, 238, 242, 243; ii., 22, 233
 Claremorris, migratory harvesters from, ii., 245
 Clarendon, Edward, Earl of, on extirpation of Irish Catholics, i., 76, 77, 81, 82, 86
 Clarke, Sir Edward, on condition of Ireland, ii., 38, 41, 42
 Cleeve, T. H., High Sheriff of Limerick, ii., 183
 Clerkenwell explosion, the, ii., 113
 Clogher, Bishop of, establishes Charter Schools in Ireland, ii., 216, 217
 Clones, i., 325
 Cloths, duty on exportation of Irish, ii., 11
 Clotworthy, Sir John, ii., 202
 Coal mines of Ireland inexhaustible, ii., 13, 14
 Cockburn, General, ii., 37
 Coercion, the policy of British Government towards Ireland, i., xii., 10; ii., 177, 181; power of, possessed by Irish landlord, ii., 121, 122
 Coercion Acts, passed by Parliament, i., 252, 272-274, 283; ii., 71, 105, 184; denounced in Parliament, i., 275, 276, 278
 Cole, Sir William, achievements of, in Ireland, i., 95, 96, 217
 Coleraine, County of, escheated lands of, ii., 125
 Colgan, —, ii., 2
 Columbanus, founder of monastery of Bobio, i., 36
 Columbus, Christopher, i., 40
 Commerce, Irish, decrease of, i., 220, 235, 243; ii., 7, 10, 51, 52, 59, 102, 164, 165
 Commission appointed to adjust Irish land claims, i., 73-75; *see* also Royal Commission.
 Commissioners of Immigration, American, i., 308
 Committee, secret, *see* Parliamentary; on Dublin Local Taxation, report of, ii., 24
 Commonwealth, the, Quaker Missions begun during, i., 115

- Confiscation of lands of Irish Catholics by British Government, i., 63-67, 71, 73-75, 79, 80, 84, 88, 97, 98, 129, 144, 145, 197; ii., 86, 89, 118, 120, 127-131, 139, 144, 151-154
- Congested District Board founded, ii., 158, 245
- Connaught, title to, claimed by English Crown, i., 73, 74; Plantations of, i., 73, 74, 76, 83, 87, 98, 99, 101, 105, 106, 172; ii., 5, 85, 128, 129, 147, 206; Nationalists in, i., 280; income tax assessment of, i., 289; valuation of ratable property in, i., 290; decrease of population and education in, i., 290; Orangemen in, i., 330, 331; bog lands in, ii., 103; Land League in, ii., 146-148; agricultural holdings in, i., 291, 292; moral conditions in, i., 293-295; United Irish League originated in, ii., 147, 148, 150; criminal record of, ii., 184; migratory harvesters from, ii., 243
- Connemara, i., 320; evictions in, ii., 97
- Connery, Daniel, sad case of, i., 102
- Consolidation Act of 1816, ii., 166
- Conspiracy of 1803 planned by British Government, i., 259-263
- Constabulary, Royal Irish, the, i., xii., 329, 332; ii., 44, 45, 94, 105, 184, 185
- Constantine the Great, i., 48
- Constitution of Britain, i., 225, 275; of the United States, ii., 162; of Ireland, i., 217, 228, 233, 251
- Convention Act, the, i., 238
- Convention Bill, the, i., 167, 219
- Convention Committee, the, ii., 141
- Convictions, proportion of, in Irish trials, i., 84-86, 169, 170, 173
- Conway, Marshal, cruelty of, i., 89
- Cooke, Mr., *Arguments for and against the Union*, cited, i., 238, 243-245
- Coote, Sir Charles, on extortion of Irish landlords, ii., 133; cruelty of, ii., 205, 206
- Copenhagen, Irish MSS. in Royal Library of, i., 36
- Copernicus, i., 28
- Corbett, T., relations of, with Emmet, ii., 270, 274, 292, 293, 303
- Cork, i., 101; lack of crime in, i., 8; ii., 185, 186; students flock to, i., 39; William Penn converted to Quakerism in, i., 115; Government spies in, i., 191; petitions against Union, i., 224; manufactures in, ii., 28; speeches made in, i., 316; ii., 114; military executions in, ii., 208
- Cork, County of, proportion of Catholics in, i., 198; criminal record of, ii., 185, 186
- Cork, Earl of, rapacity of, i., 87
- Cork Harbor, i., 299, 300
- Cormac, Mac Art, King, letters known to Irish in reign of, i., 20; Brehon laws classified in reign of, i., 26, 27
- Cormeil, ii., 263, 272
- Corn, exportation of, from Ireland, i., 299
- Corn Laws, repeal of, an injury to Ireland, i., 298; ii., 107
- Cornwallis, Lord, character of, i., 190, 206; at head of Irish Government, i., 201, 202; Pitt's instructions to, i., 225, 239
- Cotton manufactures of Ireland, ii., 18, 25, 27, 79
- Counties, the, of Ireland, i., 287-289; "proclaimed," ii., 184
- County Councils, Irish, i., 280-282; ii., 179
- County Councillors, Irish, powers of, i., 281, 282
- Cox, Sir Richard, services of, in Ireland, i., 96
- Coyne, B. W., on migratory laborers, ii., 245
- Crawford, Sharman, on Ulster tenant rights, ii., 127
- Crawford, William, Earl of, i., 43
- Crime, in Ireland, i., 9, 283; ii., 45, 46, 183-189
- Crimes Act of 1882, i., 275; ii., 156
- Criminal records at Quarterly Assizes in Ireland, *see* Assizes
- Crofters' troubles, British method of settling, ii., 154
- Cromwell, Henry, i., 103
- Cromwell, Oliver, campaign of, in Ireland, i., 36, 91-106; on siege of Drogheda, i., 92; and Connaught Plantations, i., 97-99; ii., 93, 124, 128, 139, 147; severity of laws of, against Irish Catholics, i., 109, 114, 197; ii., 5, 85, 181; duplicity of, i., 111; effect of death of, upon Ireland, i., 113, 114; attempt at Union fails, i., 236; ability of, i., 279; shipping of Irish cattle to England prohibited by, ii., 8

"Croppy," nickname for a United Irishman, i., 181
 Crops, failure of, in England, i., 315; failure of, in Ireland, i., 296-298, 315
 "Crow-bar brigade," the, ii., 98
 Crown lands in Ireland, i., 62, 72-74; ii., 85, 86, 125, 164
 Culinan, King-Bishop of Cashel, i., 26
 Cunningham, Major, character of, i., 271
 Cupples, Rev. S., Rector of Lisburn, on the Orange Association, i., 184, 185
 Curragh of Kildare, massacre on, i., 202
 Curran, —, on character of the Irish, i., 318
 Currie, Bertram, on Irish taxation, ii., 53, 63
 Curry, John, on massacre of Mullogh-maston, i., 63, 64; on ill treatment of Irish Catholics, i., 81-83; on duplicity of William III., i., 111
 Customs duties, schedule of, on Irish importations, ii., 18, 19
 Customs offices of Ireland, i., 329

D

Daily Telegraph, the, i., 319
 Dalton, Colonel, official interviews of, with Emmet, ii., 262-265, 270-272, 274, 275, 289-292, 294, 296, 298-303
 Danes, the, Irish civilization destroyed by, i., 18
 Darmesteter, M., on Ireland as the asylum of higher learning, i., 30
 Daunt, J. O'N., letter of, to John Bright, ii., 166-169; on evils of Union, ii., 170, 171
 Davidson, Morrison, on comparative taxation of England and Ireland, ii., 42
 Davis, Rev. Charles, founds industrial school, ii., 16
 Davis Industrial School, the, ii., 16
 Davis, Sir John, on Irish as law-abiding people, i., 6, 7, 25; ii., 15, 219; on Irish policy of British Government, i., 253, 254
 Davis, Thomas, poem of, cited, i., 13
 Davitt, Michael, on character of Irish judges, i., 174, 175; efforts of, in behalf of Land League movements, ii., 140, 141, 144, 160, 180
 Dawson, Charles, on Parliamentary representation, i., 176
 Deaf-mutes, proportion of, in Ireland, ii., 51
 Death-rate, in Ireland, from famine, etc., i., 66-69, 88, 297, 298, 300, 305-310, 314, 315; ii., 5, 40, 49, 71, 87, 141-143, 236, 237; among Irish emigrants, i., 309-311
 "Defenders," the, i., 145, 161, 163, 169
 "Della Crusa," ii., 2
 Denmark, ii., 9
 Derby, Lord, on the Fenian movement, ii., 113, 114
 Derry, County of, denominational strength of, i., 288, 289
 Desmond's rebellion, i., 65-68
 "Devil's Brief," the, instrument of injustice frequently used in Ireland, i., 188, 265-267
 Devlin, Anne, Irish patriot, i., 256
 Devon Commission, the, work of, ii., 91
 Dibben, T. F., on Temple's account of Irish rebellion, ii., 211
 Dickson, Rev. William Steel, a leader of the United Irishmen, i., 129, 130
 Dillon, John, aids United Irish League, ii., 144; speech of, on League, ii., 146-150; Mr. Gladstone's letter to, ii., 174
 Dillon, Sir Lucas, ii., 210
 Directory, of France, the, i., 207; of the United Irishmen, members of, i., 121, 193, 199, 205; arrest and imprisonment of, i., 199, 205, 211; before Parliamentary Committee, i., 121, 193-195, 199, 205
 Diseases of Irish caused by famine, etc., i., 306-312; ii., 51, 61
 Disfranchising Act, effect of the, ii., 165
 Dissenters, or Presbyterians, the, i., 130, 140, 141, 151, 165, 326, 327; ii., 74; of Ulster, i., 122, 125-128, 131, 286-289
 Donaghadee, ii., 213
 Donat, Bishop of Fiesole, ii., 3
 Donegal, County of, denominational strength of, i., 288; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294; industries in, ii., 69; bog lands in, ii., 103; escheated lands of, ii., 125
 Donoghue, Judith and Michael, ii., 247, 248
 Dowling, —, ii., 260

Down, County of, petitions against the Union, i., 224; religious denominations of, i., 288; Nationalists in, i., 289; immorality in, i., 293, 294; Scotch-Irish in, ii., 213

Drogheda, siege of, i., 91-94; petitions against Union, i., 224; "Parliament of the Pale" in session at, ii., 6; judges of, presented with white gloves, ii., 184; military outrages in, ii., 208

Drunkenness in Ireland, chargeable to English misrule, ii., 7

Dublin, Archbishop of, signed treaty of Windsor, i., 60

Dublin, i., 65, 73, 75, 89, 116, 230, 232, 328; ii., 46, 66; Irish tortured in, i., 87, 179, 181, 182; ii., 206, 208; Royal Irish Academy of, i., 36; second organization of United Irishmen formed in, i., 133; Journals of, i., 131, 139, 189, 324-326, 331, 332; ii., 45, 95, 222; mob in, i., 174; Government spies in, i., 190, 192; North Cork Militia stationed in, i., 181, 196; Irish leaders imprisoned in, i., 206, 211; petitions against Union, i., 224; books published in, i., 236, 321; ii., 24, 25; "chief seat of revenue," i., 243; explosion in Patrick Street, i., 264; trial and execution of Robert Emmet in, i., 266, 268-271; status of Catholics in, i., 330, 332; Trinity College of, i., 6, 36, 330; ii., 25, 74, 76, 211; silk looms in, ii., 13, 25, 26; Historical Society of, ii., 25; importance of, before the Union, ii., 23-25; desertion of, ii., 23-25; manufactures in, ii., 28, 142; University of, ii., 74, 116; plan for Catholic University in, ii., 77; conventions held at, ii., 180, 181; "proclaimed," ii., 184; criminal record of, ii., 187-189

Dublin Castle, Irish State Papers kept in John's Tower, i., 257, 271; ii., 227; attempt to seize, i., 265

Dublin Castle Cabinet, i., 6, 73, 202, 259, 329, 331; ii., 47, 66, 129, 149, 184, 185, 187, 188

Duff, Sir James, i., 202

Dufferin, Lord, on trades of Ireland, ii., 78

Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan, i., 331

Dundalh, garrison of, put to the sword, i., 94

VOL. II.—22.

Dundas, General, perfidy of, i., 202; letter of Abercrombie to, ii., 221

Dungannon, convention at, i., 118, 119, 207

Dwyer, Michael, i., 256

Dysentery, *see* Diseases.

E

Early Christian Art in Ireland, i., 35

Eclipses and comets recorded in early Irish annals, i., 19-21

Edinburgh, Woodrow MSS. in Advocate's Library of, ii., 214

Edmundson, William, established first Quaker meeting in Ireland, i., 115

Education in Ireland, i., 5, 39, 43, 44, 104-106, 323; ii., 73-78, 80-83, 159, 196, 218

Edward II., King, Brief of Pope John XXII. to, i., 57, 61; ii., 194

Edward III., King, Irish woollen manufactures in reign of, ii., 2

Edward IV., King, Connaught lands descend to, i., 74; laws enacted against Irish by, i., 108, 109

Edward VI., King, laws enacted against Irish Catholics by, i., 70

Edward VII., King, accession of, i., 279

Egan, Mr., i., 227

Eleanor of Aquitaine, i., 52

Elizabeth, Queen, i., 3; attempt to abolish the Brehon laws in reign of, i., 26; Irish wars in reign of, i., 36, 124; report of massacre of Mullaghmaston, i., 64; ecclesiastical supremacy of, i., 69, 70; ii., 213; Penal laws enacted against Catholics by, i., 69, 70, 96, 97, 114; ii., 202, 210; attempt to exterminate Irish Catholics, i., 203, 207, 284, 314; ii., 181, 196; Union suggested in time of, i., 236; Trinity College seized, ii., 74; edicts of, against Irish trade, ii., 78; Irish Land Question in time of, ii., 93, 124, 139

Ely, Marquis of Lord (Loftus), bribes paid to, i., 226

Emancipation, *see* Catholic.

Emigrant Refuge Hospital on Ward's Island, i., 308, 309, 311

Emigrant ships, horrible conditions on board of, i., 308-312, 317

Emigrants, Irish, mortality among, i., 308-311; sufferings of, on ship-board, i., 309-312, 316, 317; num-

Emigrants.—*Continued.*

- ber of, i., 103, 104, 316-318, 328; in United States aid relatives in Ireland, ii., 103
- Emigration, from Ireland, i., 126, 287, 305-307, 316-320, 328; ii., 11, 28, 29, 40, 67, 73, 167; to United States, ii., 61, 63, 87, 88, 98-100, 173, 211, 212; of Scotch-Irish to France, ii., 11, 87; a choice of evils, ii., 117
- Emmet family papers, loss of, i., 257, 258, 263, 264
- Emmet, Mary Ann, pamphlet of, on the Union, i., 216-223; ability of, ii., 26, 170; marriage and death of, ii., 170, 226, 227
- Emmet, Mrs., witnesses death of relative, i., 182; death of Mr. and, i., 264
- Emmet, Robert, resigns from Trinity College, i., 259, 264; plans to go to America, i., 259; settles in Paris, i., 259, 264; induced by Government spies to return to Ireland, i., 256, 259, 264; incited to lead outbreak of 1803, i., 259-262; begins operations, i., 264; betrayal of, i., 265; arrest and trial of, i., 149, 173, 182, 266, 267; the traitor McNally counsel for, i., 190, 266, 267; speech of, i., 260, 261; ii., 221, 222; brief for trial of, preserved, i., 267; official version of his speech, i., 268-270; conviction and death of, i., 270, 271; not a member of United Irishmen before return to Ireland, i., 270; the exponent of "physical force," ii., 161; poem of, on Irish unity, ii., 175; efforts to locate grave of, ii., 249-256
- Emmet, Thomas Addis, diary of, i., xiv., 269, 270; ii., 259 *et seq.*; value of political writings of, i., 127; on religious condition of Ireland, i., 127-129; on French Revolution, i., 131-134; on relief for Irish Catholics, i., 135, 136, 144, 145; cites Grattan's speech, i., 142; on Irish "Defenders," i., 145-147, 161, 162, 165-167; on Pitt's coalition, i., 147, 148; on persecutions of Catholics, i., 166, 167; one of Directory of United Irishmen, i., 156-159, 192, 193, 205, 260, 296; secret agent in Paris, ii., 259, 268, 270, 277, 279, 285-288, 293, 294; arrest and imprisonment of, i., 121, 192, 199, 260, 264; ii., 215, 285; examination of, before Parliamentary committee, i., 199; letter of, to Rufus King, i., 204, 205; on bribery of Parliament, i., 216, 226; on incapacity of Irish, ii., 28, 29; on overtaxation of Ireland, ii., 42; his history of Irish rebellion edited by McNeven, ii., 215, 216; on Irish in English army and navy, ii., 239, 240; settles in New York, ii., 216, 259; distrusts O'Connor, ii., 260, 261; interviews of, with Col. Dalton, ii., 263-265, 270-272, 274, 275, 289-292, 294, 296, 298-303; attempts to reconcile O'Connor and, ii., 265, 269, 283, 286, 292, 293, 296, 297; desires interview with Napoleon, ii., 267-274, 290, 296, 298; denies O'Connor's claims, ii., 270, 272, 277-279, 282, 283, 285-286, 295; interviews of, with Gen. Harty, ii., 270, 275-283, 295; solicits passport from France, ii., 277-281, 283, 287-289, 291, 292, 301; demands liberation of United Irishmen prisoners of war, ii., 281, 282, 288, 289; opinion of O'Connor, ii., 293; interviews of, with French officials, ii., 283-287, 296-299, 303
- Encumbered Estates Court, ii., 100
- England, Irish policy of, *see* British Government; treats Irish as conquered race, i., 4, 10, 32, 45, 60, 62; monastic schools founded in, by Irish missionaries, i., 31; no religious persecution in Ireland by, until sixteenth century, i., 62; tribal warfare in Ireland incited by, i., 62; title of, to Irish lands, i., 45-51, 62, 72-74; ii., 85, 86, 123-125, 135, 143, 144, 146, 153, 164, 195; war of extermination in Ireland planned in, i., 83; *see* also British Government; Great Seal of, i., 110, 113; war of, with American Colonies, i., 114, 119, 138, 201, 209, 214, 248; ii., 87, 173; Penal laws of, not in operation in Ireland, i., 8, 253, 254; disregards treaty obligations, i., 212-214; prospers under Free Trade, i., 282; ii., 28; protection in, destroys Irish industries, ii., 12, 106; violates compact with Ireland to protect linen industries, ii., 27; debt of, ii., 32-35; population of, ii., 34, 49, 50,

England.—*Continued.*

235, 236; financial relations of Ireland and, ii., 44, 49-67, 159; vast industries of, ii., 51, 59, 176, 214; proportionate taxation of, ii., 52, 53, 64; universal detestation of her misgovernment of Ireland, ii., 163; financial interests of, ii., 176; crime in, ii., 183
 English, the, victory of, at battle of Athunree, i., 61; defeat of, in Wexford, i., 200, 201; "the degenerate," ii., 6, 7
 English National Relief societies, i., 306
 English officers, brutality of, i., 66, 180, 199, 201, 202, 209; ii., 224-226
 English Press, the, antagonistic to Ireland, i., 6, 9, 10, 300, 318-321; ii., 43, 91, 177
 English prison-ships, horrors of, i., 209; ii., 225
 English Toleration Act, the, i., 125
 English troops, outrages committed by, i., 178-181, 196, 198, 199, 202, 208-210, 214; ii., 221, 224-226
 English writers, misrepresentations of Irish by, i., 2-4, 31, 42-44, 169, 180, 203; ii., 211, 212, 224; ignorance of, in regard to Irish history, i., 42-44; ii., 1
 "Enniskilleners," the, at battle of the Boyne, i., 177, 178
 Ensor, George, on evils of the Union, i., 246; ii., 24
 Episcopalians, number of, in Ulster, i., 288
 Esmonde, Sir Thomas, on prosperity of Ireland under Home Rule, ii., 59
 Essex, Earl of, i., 65
 Established Church, the, i., 117, 125, 130, 131, 135, 142, 252, 324, 331; ii., 22, 74, 75
 Ethelbert, Irish missionaries in reign of, i., 31, 43
 Eugenius III., the "good Pope," i., 57
 Europe, northern, work of Irish missionaries in, i., 27, 31
 Evangelines, Irish, i., 103, 104
 Evictions in Ireland, number of, i., 305, 312, 317; ii., 71, 88, 94-97, 103, 105; a constant menace to Irish peasantry, ii., 93, 94; sufferings caused by, ii., 94-100; statis-

tics in regard to, ii., 95; difference between Irish and English methods of, ii., 95, 96; "legalized murder," ii., 96, 97; ingenious cruelty of, ii., 117, 122, 134
 Eviction-Made-Easy Law, ii., 95, 96; infamy of, ii., 105
 Excise office, the, of Ireland, i., 329
 "Exodus," the Irish, i., 319; ii., 167, *see* Emigration.
 "Expiring Laws Continuation Bill," the, i., 272, 275
 Exports, Irish, ii., 8, 9, 13, 24-27, 87-89, 164, 167; prohibited, ii., 7-10, 12, 17, 78, 79
 Extermination, war of, in Ireland, *see* British Government.

F

Famine, in Ireland, i., 65-69, 100, 296-307, 314-316; ii., 28, 48, 58, 87, 88, 103, 142, 153, 164; misery resulting from, i., 305, 306; ii., 48, 58, 142; the Great, i., 296, 300, 301, 305; ii., 106; cause of, i., 305; deaths resulting from, i., 66-69, 88, 297, 298, 300, 305-310, 314, 315; ii., 5, 40, 49, 71, 87, 141-143, 236, 237; diseases caused by, i., 306-310, 315; frequency of, ii., 88, 103, 153
 Fardum, John, *Scotic Chronicle* of, cited, i., 61
 Farrer, Lord, on overtaxation of Ireland, ii., 43, 44, 53, 55, 63
 Faulkland, Lord, i., 74
 Fenian movement, the, ii., 112, 113, 135, 140, 167, 246
 Fenianism, described as "nationality run mad," ii., 169
 Ferguson, Sir Samuel, on Brehon law, i., 25; ballad by, i., 330
 Fermanagh, County of, religious denominations in, i., 288; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294; claimed by the Crown, ii., 125
 Fiesole, ii., 3
 Finance Committee of 1815, report of, ii., 31, 34
 Finlay, Sir R., ii., 156
 Fishing industry of Ireland, ii., 14, 15, 157
 Fitzgerald, Lord Edward, arrest and death of, i., 192, 195
 Fitzgerald, V., on Irish debt, ii., 36
 Fitzgibbon, John, *see* Clare.

Fitz-Stephen, Robert, English adventurer in Ireland, i., 50
 Fitzwilliam, Lord, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, i., 147, 149, 165; recall of, i., 150, 151, 239
 Flogging, use of, to extort confessions, i., 179, 201, 202
 Florence, use of Irish woollens in, ii., 3
 Food, chief articles of, of Irish, i., 298; ii., 88, 106-108
 Forbes, Sir John, report of moral conditions in Ireland, i., 294, 295
 Fort George, Irish prisoners in, i., 130, 206, 264; ii., 215, 260, 285, 286
 Foster, Ellen, work on Ireland, ii., 47; on evictions, ii., 94, 95
 Foster, John, on commercial relations of England and Ireland, ii., 22
 Foster, Hon. John, Speaker of the House of Commons, i., 217, 228, 229
 Fox, George, in Ireland, i., 115
 Fox, J. A., on treatment of Irish authors, i., 5, 6; on tolerance of Irish Catholics, i., 175; on coercion enactments, i., 272, 274, 275; on Ulster question, i., 286-295; on evictions, i., 303; ii., 96; on Irish industries, ii., 28; on Irish debt, ii., 39; on Irish land tenure, ii., 91-93; cites Mill on Home Rule, ii., 171-173
 France, Irish appeal to, for aid, i., 159, 193, 269, 270; Directory of, i., 207; ii., 290, 299; Pitt's influence in, i., 220; expected invasion of England by, i., 117, 265; Emmet's speech against, i., 268-270; growth of woollen manufactures in, ii., 11; emigration of Scotch-Irish to, ii., 11, 79, 87; solution of Land Question in, ii., 139, 140; negotiations of, with United Irishmen, ii., 263, *et. seq.*; expedition to aid Ireland planned, ii., 263, 267, 268, 270, 272, 274, 275, 284, 290, 295-298, 300, 301
 Frazer, Lieutenant, case of, i., 173
 Free quarters of troops in Ireland a grievance, i., 199, 201
 Free trade, effect of, on England and Ireland, i., 282, 300; ii., 28, 41, 107
Freeman's Journal, the, i., 131, 139, 324, 325, 331, 332; ii., 95, 222, 223

French Navy, condition of, ii., 177
 French Revolution, the, effect of, in Ireland, i., 131-134, 198; horrors of, insignificant compared with sufferings inflicted on Ireland, i., 152, 153; ii., 142
 "Friends of the Government," i., 170, 172, 302; ii., 48, 86
 Frosts in Ireland disastrous, ii., 87
 Froude, James Anthony, on early condition of Ireland, i., 43; on Irish trades, ii., 79, 80
 Fry Commission, the, ii., 149
 Fulton, Robert, promises to aid Ireland, ii., 290

G

Gaelic language, the, antiquity of, i., 17, 22; ii., 171; importance of, i., 30
 Gaemain, catalogue of Irish kings by, i., 18
 Galileo, i., 28
 Galvin, the hangman, i., 173
 Galway, Governor of, i., 83; town of, i., 86, 99, 103
 Galway, County of, proportion of Catholics in, i., 198; moral conditions in, i., 294; emigration from, i., 318; evictions in, ii., 96; criminal record of, ii., 187-189
 Games of Ireland, i., 37, 38
 Gardiner, Hon. Luke, on Irish commerce, ii., 10
 Garney, —, Irish cavalry of, i., 177
 Gelarius of Armagh, i., 57
 Genealogy, accuracy of Irish tribal, i., 29, 30
 George II., King, i., 121; ii., 17
 George III., King, i., 113, 168; title of, i., 248
 Georges, General, ii., 270, 271
 Germany, i., 30, 31; ii., 27, 83
 Gibson, Lieutenant, i., 88
 Gibson, Judge, *see* Assizes.
 Giffen, Sir Robert, on resources of Ireland, ii., 52, 54, 59
 Gilbert, —, English general, i., 66
 Gilla, catalogue of Irish kings by, i., 18
 Gimbaeth, Irish King, i., 18
 Gladstone, William Ewart, i., 176, 186, 283; Home Rule Bill of, i., 280, 293; ii., 40, 72, 178; Irish policy of, i., 281; ii., 42, 90, 91, 113, 136, 155, 179; report of Sir

Gladstone,—*Continued.*

- Robert Hamilton to, ii., 47; last act of, in behalf of Ireland, ii., 174; franchise placed on popular basis by, ii., 177
- Glasgow, ii., 46
- Glass manufacture in Ireland, ii., 16, 17, 26
- Glencoe, massacre of, i., 111, 202
- Gloucestershire, ii., 66
- Glove manufacture of Ireland, ii., 19, 25
- Gold work of Ireland, ii., 1
- "Gordon Highlanders," the, proportion of Irish in regiment, ii., 239
- Gordon, Lord George, riots, i., 138
- Gordon, Rev. James, on extermination of Irish Catholics, i., 208, 209
- Gormonston, Viscount, ii., 210
- Goschen, Mr., on taxation, i., 292, 293
- Government spies and informers, use of, i., 188-192, 194, 206, 260-262
- Grain crops of Ireland, ii., 88, 89
- Grand Jury, Catholics excluded from service on, i., 170
- Grantees, Irish, conditions of, ii., 124-127
- Grattan, Henry, on tithe tax, i., 131; efforts of, for Catholic Emancipation, i., 142; bill of, for Parliamentary Reform, i., 145; on bribery of Parliament, i., 226, 227; letter of, to Fox, i., 259, 260; opposed to Union, ii., 170, 173; prophecy of, ii., 173, 174; on Irish in British Army, ii., 238
- Grattan Parliament, the, i., 282; ii., 22, 39
- Great Britain, Legislative Union of, and Ireland, i., 232; revenue of, from Ireland, ii., 22-24, 29; population of, in 1801, ii., 38; benefited by Free Trade, ii., 41; pauperism in, ii., 50; relative taxable capacity of, ii., 54, 59, 60; ignorant of Irish poverty and misery, ii., 157
- Greater Ireland, ii., 143
- Green Street Court House, Dublin, i., 266, 268
- Grey, Lord, speech of, against the Union, i., 244, 245; on coercion, i., 273
- Grierson, —, report of, on Irish exports, ii., 26, 34
- Grotius, cited, i., 249
- Gurmundis, i., 50
- Guyenne lost to the English, i., 278

H

- Habeas Corpus Act, the, suspension of, in Ireland, i., 239, 245, 273, 275
- Hakluyt, on Irish linens, ii., 3
- Half-hanging, practice of, to extort confession, i., 178, 180, 202
- Hallam, Henry, on condition of Irish in Middle Ages, i., 31; on Charles I., i., 72; unfairness of, to Irish Catholics, i., 81, 82; on extermination of Irish Catholics, i., 107
- Hamilton, Sir Edward, on resources of Ireland, ii., 54, 55
- Hamilton, Sir Robert, report of Castle Government to Gladstone, ii., 47
- Hanover, House of, title of, to the throne, ii., 93
- Hansard's *Debates* cited, ii., 32, 36
- Harcourt, Sir William, ii., 76
- Hardwicke, Lord, administration of, i., 259, 261
- Hartington, Lord, ii., 156
- Harty (or Hartey), General, interview of, with Emmet, ii., 270
- Harvesters, condition of Irish migratory, ii., 103, 104, 108, 240-246
- Harvie, Captain, troops of, i., 67
- Hassenkamp, Dr., cited by Zimmer, i., 32
- Hats, manufacture of, in Ireland, ii., 18, 26
- Haulbowline, i., 299
- Hay's *Insurrection of the County of Wexford*, cited, i., 181
- Healy, Timothy, on jury-packing, ii., 219
- Hearth-money, ii., 235, 274
- Henry II., King, invasion of Ireland by, i., 1, 2, 16, 18, 31, 32, 50, 107, 232; title of, to Ireland granted by Papal Bull, i., 45; ii., 191, 192, 194; character of, i., 52-54, 60; promises obedience to anti-pope, i., 53; treaty of Windsor, i., 60
- Henry III., King, grants Irish lands to Richard de Burgo, i., 74
- Henry VII., King, statutes of, i., 74; ii., 7, 210
- Henry VIII., King, subjugation of Ireland attempted by, i., 60, 62, 63; laws against Irish Catholics enacted by, i., 70; earns title of "Defender of the Faith," ii., 74
- Heppenstal, Lieutenant, brutality of, i., 180

Heremon I., Irish King, i., 50
 Hessian troops in Ireland, i., 145, 152
 "Hibernia, Island of the Scots," i., 35
 High Court of Ireland, number of judges of the, i., 329
 Higher education denied to Irish Catholics, ii., 159
 Hill, Arthur, ii., 202
 Hill, Rev. George, ii., 215
 Holland, Pitt's influence in, i., 220; linen manufactures of, ii., 27, 28; agriculture of, ii., 214
 Holland, Lord, protests against the Union, i., 244
 Holmes, Robert, marries Mary Ann Emmet, ii., 170, 226; on independence of Ireland, ii., 170, 171; imprisonment of, ii., 226, 227
 Home Rule, great desire for, in Ireland, i., 1, 119, 120, 176, 280-282; ii., 42, 53, 54, 83-85, 95, 141, 151, 152, 155, 171, 173; granted in 1782, i., 119, 158, 248, 249; ii., 21, 227; prosperity of Ireland under, i., 120, 158, 241, 248, 282, 285, 293; ii., 21, 22, 47, 59, 60, 64, 69, 70, 162, 167; in abeyance, i., 228, 229; ii., 23, 31, 76, 140, 144, 180; future possibilities of, i., 254, 285, 293; ii., 37, 47, 70, 73, 97, 111, 112, 162, 171-174; opposed by Queen Victoria, ii., 72
 Home Rule Bills, i., 280, 292; ii., 40, 72, 178
 Hone, Mr., on Irish wool, ii., 9
 Hope, James, Irish patriot, i., 256
 Hops, tax on, ii., 17, 18
 House of Commons, British, i., 5, 139, 275, 276, 278-280, 292, 293, 320; ii., 38, 42, 67, 72, 97, 99, 106, 144, 219
 House of Commons, Irish, i., 120, 121, 136, 139, 141, 143, 199, 216, 217, 224-228, 233, 238, 246; ii., 160, 173; disbanded, i., 228, 229
 House of Lords, British, i., 138, 278-280; ii., 144, 157
 House of Lords, Irish, i., 139, 216
 Hoveden, Roger de, on Henry II., i., 53-55
 Howard, John, on state of prisons, ii., 217
 Hudson, —, ii., 260
 Huguenots, at battle of the Boyne, i., 177
 Humbert, General, ii., 290, 294, 298

Hume, David, unreliability of, as historian, i., 81
 Hunter, Professor, on Irish taxation, ii., 53
 Hurley, Archbishop, torture and death of, i., 66
 Hutchinson, Hely, work of, destroyed by Government, i., 5, 6
 Hyde, Douglass, on the Brehon laws, i., 24-26; on erudition of early Irish, i., 27-30
 Hyland, —, case of, i., 180

I

Illegitimacy, proportion of, in Irish provinces, i., 293-295
 Income tax, a permanent tax on Ireland, ii., 60; assessments for Irish provinces, i., 289
 India, i., 210, 221, 331; ii., 77
 Indian corn, cultivation of, in Ireland, ii., 106, 107; importation of, into Ireland, i., 290
 Indictments against Irish Catholics, *see* Convictions.
 Industrial School Act, ii., 16
 Industries, Irish, destruction of, i., 124, 125, 178; ii., 10, 12, 17, 24-28, 51, 66, 67, 69, 78-80, 87, 106, 107, 142, 162, 164; condition of, at present day, ii., 47
 Informers, Government, *see* Government.
 Ingoldsby, Colonel Henry, i., 102
 Inspectors, County, i., 329, 332; District, i., 329, 332
 Insurrection Act, the, i., 167, 273
 Ireland, British policy in government of, i., 1, 10-13, 16, etc.; *see also* British Government; invasion of, by Henry II., i., 1, 2, 16, 18, 31, 32, 46-48, 51, 60, 107, 232, 275; title to, granted by Papal Bull, i., 45-51, 54, 55, 57, 59; ii., 194; government and offices of, i., xiii., 148, 216, 225, 247, 281, 305, 328, 329; ii., 32, 57, 66, 94, 105, 149, 163; Constabulary force in, i., xii., 329, 332; ii., 44, 45, 94, 105, 184, 185; National school system in, i., xiii., 17; ii., 216-218; Home Rule for, *see* Home Rule; early culture and civilization of, i., 16-22, 26-30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 43, 44; ii., 171; early settlers of, i., 16-18, 22, 29; ii., 191, 192; accuracy of early written records of, i., 19-21;

Ireland,—*Continued.*

Christianity introduced into, by St. Patrick, i., 20, 26, 28, 116; establishment of colleges and universities in, i., 26, 28; learning and celebrity of schools of, i., 28-30, 33, 34, 39, 43, 44; ii., 2; Brehon laws of, i., 22-27, 43, 254, 314; early commercial relations of, i., 27; ii., 1-3, 22; *see also* Commerce; English adventurers in, i., 50, 56; ii., 170; lands in, held under clan system, i., 29, 62; religious conditions in, i., 55, 62, 110-116, 122, 123, 125-134, 141, 143, 160, 323-333; religious animosities in, incited, i., 135, 143-147, 149-152, 165, 183, 193; ii., 196, 221; subjugation of, attempted by Henry VIII., i., 62, 63; subjugation of, completed under William III., i., 108; confiscated lands of, *see* Confiscation; diseases and deaths in, resulting from war and famine, i., 66-69, 88, 297-303, 305-312, 314, 315; ii., 5, 40, 49, 51, 61, 71, 87, 141-143, 236, 237; persecution of Catholics in, *see* Catholics; severity of Penal laws enforced in, i., 70, 74, 96, 97, 101, 105, 108, 109, 111, 114, 122, 135-140, 222, 223, 253, 254, 276; ii., 4, 69, 81, 82, 86, 93, 131, 133, 201-204, 211, 212; English Plantations of, i., 65, 66, 71, 73, 74, 76, 83, 87, 91-106, 123, 145, 172; ii., 5, 85, 89, 125-129, 147, 206, 213-215; proportion of religious denominations in, i., 74, 123, 126-130, 137, 186, 187, 286-289, 324-329; ii., 75; acreage of, i., 80; area of, ii., 89; administration of justice in, a farce, i., 83-85, 149, 168-171, 180, 265, 266, 273; ii., 90, 149, 164; staple food products of, i., 100, 131, 298; ii., 5, 88, 106-108; famines in, *see* Famine; restrictive enactments of British Government against trade and manufactures of, i., 106-108, 125; ii., 4-15, 17-19, 24-30, 78, 79, 88, 89, 106, 135, 157, 164; population of, i., 108, 137, 297, 298, 320, 321; ii., 38, 45, 49-52, 56, 57, 62, 171, 185, 235; the Orangemen of, i., 110, 114, 123, 146, 148, 152, 159, 161, 163-167, 176-181, 183-187, 193, 200, 201, 208, 209, 215, 224, 233, 238, 261, 262, 280, 282, 286, 294,

295, 303, 322; ii., 73; the Union of Great Britain and, established, i., 206, 230, 251; ii., 177; *see also* Union; Quaker Missions in, i., 115; Jews find refuge in, i., 116; concessions to, wrung from British Government, i., 119, 136, 138; ii., 22, 23; organization of the United Irishmen, i., 121, 126, 130, 131, 133-136, 156, 158-160, 165, 193, 194, 196-200, 205, 211, 212, 220, 269, 270; emigration from, i., 125, 126, 287, 305, 307, 316-320, 328; ii., 11, 28, 29, 40, 61, 63, 67, 73, 79, 87, 88, 167, 173, 211, 212; causes of Rebellion of 1798 in, i., 129, 130, 152, 155, 166-168, 177, 192-197, 199, 261, 262; ii., 23, 221; effect of French Revolution upon, i., 130-133; Hessian troops in, i., 145; use of torture in, i., 179-181; perversion of facts relating to, by British Government, i., 157; placed under martial law, i., 159, 239, 245, 248, 273, 315; ii., 114; appeals to France for assistance, i., 159, 193, 265, 269, 270; ii., 263 *et seq.*; number of troops in, i., 219; ii., 44, 45; coercion the method of governing, i., 221-223, 252, 272-274, 278, 283, 284; ii., 177; list of Coercion Acts, i., 274; sovereignty of Kingdom of, i., 119, 120, 158, 222, 228, 229, 232, 248; ii., 20, 21, 25, 43, 66, 151, 152, 155, 169-171; evils of absenteeism in, i., 235, 243, 246; ii., 23, 24, 29, 37, 51, 69, 105, 106, 108, 166; suspension of Habeas Corpus Act in, i., 239, 245, 273, 275; effects of Reform Acts on, i., 250, 252; injustice to, in relation to Parliamentary representation, i., 254, 255; ii., 38, 66, 234-238; efforts of Emmet to emancipate, i., 260-262; effect of Free Trade and Protection on prosperity of, i., 282, 283, 298-300; ii., 28, 41, 65, 106, 107; absence of crime in, i., 9, 283; ii., 45, 46, 183-189; future of, i., 283; ii., 67, 69, 70, 73, 85, 108-111, 159, 161, 162, 171, 174, 175, 182; income-tax assessments for provinces of, i., 289, 290; comparison of social conditions in provinces and counties of, i., 287-295; boroughs of, i., 291; counties of,

Ireland,—*Continued.*

- i., 287, 288; ii., 184; provinces of, i., 290, 292; United Irish League in, i., 292; ii., 68, 112, 144, 146, 147, 150, 151, 153, 155, 159, 160, 174, 175, 184; overtaxation of, i., 297; ii., 29, 31-43, 56-63, 66, 102, 103, 107, 108, 164, 166; decrease in population of, i., 306, 307, 319, 320; ii., 28, 34, 40, 42, 44, 51, 56, 57, 67, 70, 87, 161, 166, 171, 179, 236; fertility of, i., 298, 318, 319, 321; ii., 88, 103, 160, 171; exports and imports of, i., 298, 299, 315, 316; ii., 2, 8-10, 12, 17-19, 24-27, 33, 78, 79, 87, 89, 102, 164, 167, 235-238; relative proportion of, in England and, i., 299; ii., 22, 33, 235, 236; cost of government of, i., 300, 301; ii., 32, 35, 36, 44-47, 60, 161; bog lands of, *see* Land; pauperism in, i., 302, 303; ii., 5, 10, 50, 51, 61, 63; the saddest country in the world, i., 306; proportion of diseased or crippled in, i., 306-312; ii., 51, 61; manufactures of, ii., 1-3, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 25, 27, 43, 61, 63; average consumption of spirits and malt liquors in, ii., 7, 43, 63, 64; comparison of duties on imports into Great Britain and, ii., 12, 18, 19, 62; coal mines of, ii., 13, 14; rents in, exorbitant, ii., 23, 24, 93, 104, 108, 124, 127, 132-134, 136-139, 141, 148, 149, 189, 235, 238; emigrants aid payment of rents in, i., 321, 322; ii., 103, 108; enormous increase of public debt of, ii., 32-35, 37, 39, 40, 58, 60, 62, 164; proportionate taxation of, ii., 34-36, 38, 39, 41, 52, 53, 56, 57, 59, 60, 66, 153; financial relations of England and, ii., 44, 49-67, 159; Poor laws in, ii., 50, 107, 134, 247; agriculture in, ii., 51, 67-69, 88, 89, 102, 154, 157; taxable capacity of, ii., 52-63, 66; resources of, ii., 52, 53, 55, 66, 67, 80, 161; separate fiscal system intended for, ii., 55, 57, 58, 62, 65, 66; transit rates and facilities in, ii., 64; arable and pasture lands of, *see* Land; reign of Queen Victoria disastrous to, ii., 71, 72; visit of Queen Victoria to, ii., 72; lack of enthusiasm in, over the Jubilee, ii., 71-73; number of evictions in, during reign of Queen Victoria, ii., 71; *see also* Evictions; evils of landlordism in, ii., 90-96, 104-106, 117, 119, 120, 122, 130-135, 139, 144, 146, 148, 149; tenant rights in, ii., 90, 131-133, 137, 138; yearly tax for rents in, ii., 102; wages in, ii., 106-108, 132, 243; Fenian movement in, ii., 112-114, 135, 140, 167; Land League movement in, ii., 112, 136-145, 149; state of vassalage or serfdom in, ii., 116-118, 120, 121, 128, 130-133; treatment of laboring class in, ii., 131-135, 150; local government for, ii., 144, 163, 178; effort of British Government to conciliate, ii., 144, 176; political situation of, in 1901, ii., 181; loses confidence in France, ii., 264, 287, 288
- "Ireland-it-Mikla," Norse name for North America, i., 40
- Ireton, General, i., 94
- Irish, the, characteristics of, i., 6-9, 11, 12, 14, 104, 300, 321, 322, 327; ii., 1, 7, 12, 15, 43, 48, 173, 219; misunderstood by the English, i., 10, 31; ancestry of, i., 21-23, 29, 34, 35, 104, 105; expert navigators, i., 27, 28, 40; ii., 1; grievances of, i., 32, 133, 199, 201, 219, 238, 239, 254, 255; ii., 31, 44, 45, 76, 100, 115, 135, 159, 167, 169, 194; treated as a conquered race, i., 32, 133, 137, 213, 229, 275; ii., 135; national amusements of, i., 37, 38; ii., 142; law relating to surnames of, i., 101; ii., 211, 212; hatred of, for England, i., 129, 305, 306, 312; ii., 86, 99, 100; demands of, for religious liberty, i., 133, 141, 143, 144, 146; accept the Union in despair, i., 229, 251; assemblies of, prohibited, i., 238, 239; proportion of, in British army and navy, ii., 29, 60, 238-240; poverty of, ii., 102-111, 157, 158; cry of, ii., 141; imbibe American social theories, ii., 141
- Irish authors, treatment of, i., 5, 6, 88, 89, 107; ii., 189
- Irish ballads, i., 330, 331
- Irish Bar, the, i., 332, 333
- Irish Bench, the, i., 149, 172-175, 180, 329; ii., 46, 47, 184, 189
- Irish Channel, the, ii., 77, 172
- Irish Church Fund, ii., 65
- Irish Constitution, the, Parliament no

Irish Constitution,—*Continued.*
 right to vote away, i., 217, 228, 233, 249-251
 Irish "Defenders," organization of, i., 145, 161-163, 169
Irish Felon, the, ii., 137
 Irish genealogical books, accuracy of, i., 29, 30
 Irish gentry, the, i., 104-106, 129; ii., 6
 Irish harvesters in Great Britain, ii., 103, 104, 108, 240-246
 Irish journals, i., 131, 139, 324, 325, 331; ii., 95, 146, 183, 184, 190, 222, 240, 246
 Irish (Gaelic) language, the, i., xiii., 17, 21, 22, 40; ii., 171, 217
 Irish MSS., destruction of, i., 36; extant, i., 34-36
 Irish missionaries, piety, learning, and zeal of, i., 27, 31, 33-40, 43
 Irish peasantry, the, i., 104-106, 129, 326-328; ii., 64, 86, 93, 94
 Irish Peerages created, i., 226, 240, 244; extinct, i., 246
 Irish Peers, i., 330; ii., 23
Irish People, the, ii., 246
 Irish Press, the, accurate statements of, ii., 46, 47, 67, 68; reduced to silence, i., 165; controlled by Government, ii., 190
 Irish priests, the, persecution of, i., 136, 139; lead insurgents, i., 203, 204
 Irish prisoners sold to American Colonies, i., 101-104; cruel treatment of, i., 87-89, 284
 Irish Privy Council, the, i., 139
 "Irish reign of terror," i., 179, 181, 196, 197, 207, 241; ii., 85, 86
 Irish Remonstrance addressed to Pope John XXII., i., 61; ii., 190-194
 Irish State Papers, i., 257, 258, 263-266, 271
 Irish wool, fine quality of, ii., 9
Irish World, the, ii., 146, 183, 184, 240
 Iron industries of Ireland, ii., 13
 Isle Magee, massacre of, i., 82, 83
 Isle of Saints, i., 30
 Italy, Irish MSS. in, i., 35, 36

J

Jackson, Henry, arrest of, i., 192
 Jackson, Hugh, arrest of, i., 146, 192
 Jamaica, i., 103
 Jamaica rum, ii., 12

James, Sir Henry, ii., 156
 James I., King, i., 7, 36; ii., 197, 198; Brehon law system abolished in reign of, i., 26; treatment of Catholics by, i., 70, 71, 97, 197; death of, i., 72; Penal laws enacted by, i., 114; Plantation of Ulster by, i., 71, 123; ii., 85; grants of, ii., 124-129, 139
 James II., King, i., 109-111, 115; cowardice of, at battle of the Boyne, i., 110
 Jamestown, i., 71
Jamestown, the, i., 300
 Jay treaty, the, i., 214
Jewish Chronicle, the, i., 116
 Jews, the, find asylum in Ireland, i., 116
 Jocelyn, Lord (Lord Roden), i., 202
 John of Tuam, Archbishop, i., 319
 John XXII., Pope, Brief of, to Edward II., i., 57; ii., 194; Irish Remonstrance addressed to, i., 61; ii., 190-194
 Johnson, Dr., on persecution of Irish Catholics, i., 141
 Johnson, Judge, *see* Assizes.
 Johnson, Sir William, name changed from MacShane to, ii., 211
 John's Tower, *see* Dublin Castle.
 Jonson, Ben, condition of Ireland described by, i., 108
 Jubilee, Queen Victoria's, ii., 71-73, 179, 184
 Judges, Irish, i., 149, 172-175, 180, 329; ii., 46, 47, 184, 189
 "Junto," the, ii., 77, 80
 Jurgisius, i., 50
 Jury, trial by, British Constitution based upon, i., 275; suspension of, in certain Irish counties, ii., 184, 188, 189
 Jury-packing sanctioned by British Government, i., xii., 168, 170, 171, 174; ii., 218-220
 Justice, farcical administration of, in Ireland, i., 84-86, 163, 164, 168-171, 240, 273; ii., 149, 162, 164

K

Keating, Rev. Geoffrey, i., 2, 3; on Irish chronicles, i., 21, 22, 29, 30
 Kelp, Irish, superior quality of, ii., 17, 79
 Kenny, Judge, *see* Assizes.
 Kerry, County of, proportion of Catholics in, i., 198; emigration from, i.,

Kerry,—*Continued.*

- 318; sheep raising in, ii., 9; bog lands of, ii., 103
 Kildare, County of, military executions in, i., 199; massacre on the Curragh of, i., 202; grants of James I. in, ii., 128
 Kildysart, O'Kelly's speech at, ii., 152
 "Kilkenny, Confederation of," i., 78
 Kilkenny, spread of Quakerism in, i., 115; statute of, ii., 6; manufactures in, ii., 26, 28
 Kilmainham prison, i., 271
 Kilwarden (Wolffe), Lord, an honest judge, i., 174
 King, Rufus, letter of T. A. Emmet to, i., 204
 Kingsborough, Lord, i., 217
 Kinsale, i., 67, 101
 Knox, John, ii., 214

L

- Laborate Act, the, i., 298
 Labouchère, Mr., on Irish tenure of land, ii., 91
 Lake, General, i., 202
 Lalor, James Finton, inspirer of the Land League, ii., 136-138
 Land, primitive title to, ii., 92, 108, 109, 123, 137, 147; English title to Irish, i., 45-51, 62, 72-74; ii., 85, 86, 135, 143, 144, 146, 153, 164; confiscation of Irish, *see* Confiscation; Irish bog, i., 321, 322; ii., 68, 88, 103, 242; arable, in Ireland, ii., 68, 89, 160; arable land turned into grazing, i., 125, 319; ii., 8, 28, 68, 86, 88, 89, 107, 108, 154, 160, 164; decrease in value of Irish, ii., 67, 68, 73, 88; custom of subletting, ii., 105, 164, 165
 "Land for the People," ii., 141
 Land Acts, passed, ii., 88-90, 104, 105, 154; of Mr. Gladstone, ii., 91, 179; of 1870, ii., 113; of 1896, ii., 148, 150; of 1881, ii., 156
 Land Purchase Acts, ii., 103, 157, 158
 Land Bills, list of rejected, i., 276, 277; ii., 156, 157
 Land Commission, of Ireland, ii., 149, 150, 160
 Land courts, decision of, ii., 91, 156, 157
 Land grants in Ulster, conditions of, ii., 124-129

- Land League movement in Ireland, ii., 112, 159; origin and growth of, ii., 136-145, 146-149, 153, 159, 180
 Land legislation the cause of Irish famine, i., 305
 Land Question, the, in Ireland, ii., 70, 85-143, 149, 150; solution of, ii., 139-141, 149, 154, 158, 160, 163; in France, ii., 139; in Belgium, ii., 139, 140; in Prussia, ii., 139, 140
 Land tenure in Ireland, system of, ii., 89, 90-93, 102-111, 116-135, 143-145
 Landlordism, Irish, evils of, ii., 90-96, 100, 104-106, 117, 119, 120, 130-135, 139, 144, 146, 148, 149
 Landlords and tenants, laws affecting, ii., 89-92, 109-111, 135, 153, 154, 163
 Landlords, Irish, power of, ii., 93-101, 104-106, 116, 117, 121, 131-135, 149; conduct of, in famine periods, i., 303, 304; make no improvements, ii., 90, 104, 105; proprietary rights of, ii., 90, 124, 125, 146; rents of, ii., 103, 105, 106, 108; *see also* Rents; an alien race, ii., 139
 "Landlords must go," ii., 109, 144, 146
 Langford, grants of James I. in, ii., 128
 Langrishe, Sir Hercules, bill of, for relief of Catholics, i., 136, 141
 Lanigan, Rev. John, on Pope Adrian's Bull, i., 56-58
 Lansdowne, Marquis of, cruel death of child on estate of, ii., 247, 248
 Latin, knowledge of, among Irish, i., 30, 106
 Lauderdale, Earl of, i., 6
 Lawless, —, on oppression of the Irish, i., 14
 Leagues, *see under* Land and United Irish.
 Leather, manufacture of, in Ireland, ii., 9; duties on, ii., 18, 78
 Lecky, W. E. H., on confiscation of Irish lands, i., 63, 65-68; on tolerance of Irish Catholics, i., 114-116; on concessions granted to Irish, i., 119; on United Irishmen, i., 155-157, 169; on case of Lieutenant Frazer, i., 173; on the Orange Association, i., 184, 185; on Pitt, ii., 39, 40

- Legislation of British Government relating to Ireland, *see under* Ireland and British Government.
- Leinster, County of, confiscations of lands in, i., 63, 87; arrest of delegates from, i., 192; vote of Nationalists in, i., 280; income tax assessment of, i., 289; education in, i., 290; valuation of ratable property in, i., 290; decrease in population of, i., 290; houses and agricultural holdings in, i., 291, 292; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294; United Irish League movement in, ii., 150
- Leinster, King of, i., 50, 56
- Leitrim, County of, moral conditions in, i., 294; criminal record at assizes in, ii., 185, 186
- Leland, Thomas, on Irish annals, i., 64; on Connaught "Plantation," i., 74; on extermination of Irish Catholics, i., 76, 77; on escheated lands of Ulster, i., 127
- Leo X., Pope, rewards Henry VIII., ii., 74
- Letterkenny, i., 325
- Levellers, the, ii., 135
- Lewis, Sir George, on Irish landlords, ii., 130
- Liffchar, Carbre, Irish King, poem by, i., 17
- Liffey River, the, i., 182; ii., 25
- Limerick, surrender of, i., 110, 113; treaty of, i., 110, 213; violation of treaty of, i., 112, 113; spread of Quakerism in, i., 115; petitions against Union, i., 224
- Limerick, County of, proportion of Catholics in, i., 198; serge trade of, ii., 26
- Limerick, criminal record of, ii., 183, 187, 188
- Lindsey, Hon. Colin, on Irish culture and civilization, i., 43, 44
- Linen, manufactures of Ireland, importance of, i., 244, 289; ii., 1-3, 27, 29, 214; use of, regulated by act of Parliament, ii., 3, 4; duty on importation of, into Ireland, ii., 18; exportation of, from Ireland prohibited, ii., 4; manufacturers beggared, ii., 27
- Lingard, Rev. John, on Pope Adrian's Bull, i., 50, 51, 59; untrustworthy as historian, i., 79
- Lisburn, i., 184
- Lismore, Christian of, i., 57
- Liverpool, i., 299, 300
- Livingston, William, Governor of New Jersey, on cruelty of British soldiers, i., 209; ii., 224, 225
- Local Government Bill, the, passage of, i., 170; ii., 144; the entering wedge for Home Rule, i., 253, 254; ii., 73; scope of, i., 281, 282; ii., 163, 179
- Local Government Board of Ireland, i., 329
- Locke, John, on civil government, i., 249, 250; ii., 25
- Loe, Thomas, Quaker, i., 115
- Loftus, Sir Adam, ii., 199, 202
- Lombard, Peter, cited, i., 70
- London company for "reducing the Kingdom of Ireland," i., 79
- London, Gordon riots in, i., 138; Irish State Papers in, i., 257; Press, i., 321
- Londonderry, County of, moral conditions in, i., 293, 294; Scotch-Irish in, ii., 213
- Longford, County of, criminal record of, ii., 184, 187, 188
- Lords Justices of Ireland, treaty signed by, i., 110; ii., 201
- Louis VII., King, i., 52
- Louth, County of, the "Defenders" in, i., 145, 169
- Louvain, Irish MSS. in, i., 36
- Lucas, Mr., murder of, i., 163
- Lucius III., Pope, i., 54
- Ludlow, General Edmund, on Cromwell's Irish campaign, i., 92, 95
- Lunacy, proportion of, in Ireland, ii., 51
- Lurgan, first Irish Quaker meeting held in, i., 115
- Luther, Martin, Defence of the Church by Henry VIII. against, ii., 74
- Lymington, Lord, ii., 156
- Lynch, Rev. D., on Irish missionaries i., 34, 35; on Bull of Pope Adrian, i., 57, 58

M

- Macaulay, Lord, on relations between England and France, ii., 168, 169
- MacColl, Rev. Malcolm, Canon Residentiary of Ripon, on injustice to Ireland, ii., 76-84
- MacGeoghegan, Abbé, gives abstract of will of Cathire More, i., 37; on Bull of Adrian IV., i., 46-50, 57, 61; on Bull of Alexander III., i., 51-55; on Queen Elizabeth's eccle-

- MacGeoghegan, — *Continued.*
 siastical supremacy, i., 69; on ex-
 termination of Irish Catholics, i.,
 94, 95
 Mackintosh, Sir James, authenticity
 of, as historian, i., 21
 MacShane, William, *see* Johnson.
 MacVeagh, Mr., i., 332
 McCann, Mr., on taxation of Ireland,
 ii., 60, 66
 McCormack, Mr., escapes arrest, i.,
 192
 McDonell, Sir Anthony, i., 331
 McGuire, Mr., letter to, ii., 277,
 280
 McNally, Leonard, Government "in-
 former," i., 190, 266, 267; counsel
 for Robert Emmet, i., 266, 267
 McNeven, Dr. William James, one
 of Directory of United Irishmen,
 i., 121, 193, 156-159, 168; arrest
 of, i., 121, 192, 211, 212; pam-
 phlet of, on Union, i., 211-216;
 edits Emmet's History of Irish Re-
 bellion, ii., 216; distrusts O'Connor,
 ii., 261; in Paris, ii., 293, 294 299,
 300
 McNulty, Dr., Bishop of Meath, on
 evictions, ii., 98-100
 Madden, Dr. Richard R., on Govern-
 ment protection of Orangemen, i.,
 167; on "Battalion of Testimony,"
 i., 189; on Rebellion of 1798, i.,
 207, 208; on Miss Emmet's pam-
 phlet, i., 217; on conspiracy of 1803;
 i., 259-262; writes life of Robert
 Emmet, i., 260-263; ii., 259, 260
 Madden, Judge, *see* Assizes.
 Magee, D'Arcy, i., 331
 Mahaffy, Professor, on "The Roman-
 ization of Ireland," i., 325, 326,
 328, 330, 331
 Mandeville, John, murder of, i., 284
 Manufactures of Ireland, destruction
 of, ii., 51, 102, 142, 164, 165; in-
 crease of, in Britain, ii., 51
 Marlborough, Duke of, i., 257, 258
 Marriages between Catholics and
 Protestants, penalties for, i., 136,
 140
 Marsden, Secretary, i., 259, 261
 Martial law in Ireland, *see* Ireland.
 Mary, Queen, persecution in reign of,
 i., 63, 115
 Mary, Queen of Scots, ii., 214
 Mary, William and, *see* William.
 Maryborough, i., 63
 Mason, St. John, ii., 261
 Massacre of Glencoe, i., 111, 202; of
 Isle Magee, i., 81-84
 Massena, General, to command
 French expedition to Ireland, ii.,
 263, 267, 294
 Mathew of Westminster, i., 49
 Maxwell, S. L., letter of, on toler-
 ance of Catholics, ii., 223
 Mayflower, the, i., 103
 Maynooth, ii., 65
 Mayo, County of, moral conditions
 in, i., 294; ii., 185-187; poverty
 of, i., 316; wages in, ii., 108; mi-
 gratory harvesters from, ii., 245
 Meath, Bishop of, ii., 98
 Meath, County of, murders in, i., 64,
 109; disturbances by the "De-
 fenders" in, i., 145
 Meats, salted, prohibitive duties on,
 ii., 78
 Methodists, British Government es-
 tablishes university for, ii., 74
 Milan, Irish MSS. in the Ambrosian
 Library of, i., 35
 Milesians, the, early settlers of Ire-
 land i., 29
 Military executions in Ireland, i., 199,
 205
 Mill, John Stuart, on property in
 land, ii., 92; on Home Rule, ii.,
 171-173
 Mitchell, John, on Irish famines, i.,
 297-300; on right of retaliation,
 ii., 115; letter of, ii., 246, 247
 Molyneux, —, works of, destroyed,
 i., 6
 Monaghan, County of, disturbances
 by the "Defenders" in, i., 145;
 petitions against the Union, i.,
 224; religious denominations in, i.,
 288, 325; moral conditions in, i.,
 293, 294; Coote's survey of, cited,
 ii., 133
 Monastic schools founded by Irish
 missionaries, i., 27, 31, 33-40, 43
 Moore, Thomas, on accuracy of Irish
 annals, i., 19, 20; ballads of, cited,
 ii., 174
 Moore, —, ii., 210
 Moran, Irish King, i., 23
 Morley, John, on qualities of the
 Irish, i., 322; on Irish rents, ii.,
 157; warning of, to the *Times*, ii.,
 179
 Morris, Judge O'Connor, presented
 with white gloves, ii., 184
 Moryson, Fynes, on Irish famine, i.,
 68, 69

Motley, John L., on artisan refugees in England, ii., 213, 214
 Mountjoy, English commander in Irish wars, i., 66, 68
 Moynahan, M., ii., 246
 Mulloghmaston, the massacre of, i., 63, 64
 Munro, General, i., 89
 Munster, Plantation of, i., 65, 66; ii., 128, 206; desolation in, i., 68, 95; vote of Nationalists in, i., 280; income-tax assessment of, i., 289; valuation of ratable property in, i., 290; population and education in, i., 290; houses and agricultural holdings in, i., 291, 292; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294
 Murphy, Captain, to command French vessel, ii., 273, 275, 292, 300, 301, 303
 Murphy, Father, commands at battle of Arklow, i., 203
 Murphy, Joseph, ii., 242
 Musgrove, Richard, on the "Defenders," i., 169
 Music, early Irish church, i., 37, 38
 Mutiny Bill, the, i., 118; ii., 100

N

Naas, i., 202
 Naples, Irish MSS. in the Real Biblioteca Borbonica of, i., 36
 Napoleon, compared with Mr. Pitt, i., 153; injures England's commerce, i., 258; negotiations of, with agents of United Irishmen, ii., 266 *et seq.*
Nation, the, i., 299, 317
 National Land League, the, ii., 141
 National school system, the, in Ireland, i., xiii., 17; ii., 216-218
 Nationalists, strength of the, in Ireland, i., 280-282; ii., 70, 144, 177-179; strong in Ulster, i., 287-289, 292; benefited by the United Irish League, ii., 150-152, 180, 181, 184; represented in Parliament, ii., 177, 180; denounce system of jury-packing, ii., 219
 Navigation Acts, the effect of, on Ireland, ii., 8, 79
 Navigators, the Irish excellent, i., 27, 28, 40; ii., 1
 Navy, the British, proportion of Irish in, ii., 29, 60
 Neilson, Samuel, leader of the United Irishmen, i., 151; ii., 260
 Nenagh, ii., 187
 New England, Irish prisoners sent to, i., 101, 103
 Newenham, Thomas, on crime in Ireland, i., 78; on meeting of Volunteers, i., 118, 119; on political condition of Ireland, i., 143; on Irish rebellion incited by British Government, i., 191, 198; on Irish opposition to the Union, i., 224; on results of the Union, i., 234, 255; on proportion of Catholics in North Cork Militia, ii., 224; on injustice of Irish Parliamentary representation, ii., 234-238; on injuries to Irish trade and manufactures, ii., 6, 9, 12, 17-20
 Newfoundland, Irish fishermen not allowed to fish on the banks of, ii., 14
 Newgate Prison, i., 165, 211, 271
 New Jersey, Livingston's speech to General Assembly of, i., 209
 Newry, put to the sword, i., 89, 94; petitions against the Union, i., 224
 New York, i., 271, 308, 321; ii., 98, 160, 183; Thomas A. Emmet settles in, ii., 216
 New York *World*, the, ii., 189
 New Zealand, i., 282
Nineteenth Century Magazine, the, articles in, i., 325, 328-331; ii., 222
 Non-conformists, the, hardships of, in Ireland, i., 125, 126; bigotry of, ii., 77
 Norbury, Lord (Mr. Toler), unjust judge, i., 149, 180; presides at trial of Robert Emmet, i., 149, 172-174, 268, 269
 Nore, mutiny at the, i., 162
 Normandy lost to England, i., 278
 Normans, the, destroy records of early civilization of Ireland, i., 16, 18
 Norsemen, the, find Irish in America, i., 40
 North, Lord, on concessions to Irish, i., 119
 North Cork Militia, stationed in Dublin, i., 181, 196; brutality of, in Wexford, i., 196, 198, 199; ii., 223, 224
 Northampton, Labouchère speech at, ii., 91
 Norway, Irish exports to, ii., 9
 Nubrigius, cited, i., 47, 49
 Nugent, Lord, on destitution of Irish, ii., 106

O

- Oak, Irish, famous for ship-building purposes, ii., 14
- Oath, of Allegiance, the, Catholics permitted to take, i., 138; of Extermination, i., 195, 208; of Supremacy, the, i., 125, 140
- Oblivion, Act of, *see* Act.
- O'Brien, Chief Justice, *see* Assizes.
- O'Brien, Jemmy, fate of, i., 180
- O'Brien, Murrough, leads attack on Cashel, i., 94, 95
- O'Brien, Patrick, ii., 218
- O'Brien, Smith, i., 319
- O'Brien, William, inaugurates the United Irish League, ii., 144, 178, 180
- O'Brien's dictionary, i., 17
- O'Conally, Owen, fabrication of Irish plot by, i., 79
- O'Connell, Daniel, stigmatizes Lord Norbury, i., 173; on accomplishment of the Union, i., 240, 241, 245; Catholic Emancipation obtained by efforts of, ii., 114, 115
- O'Connor, Arthur, one of the Directory of United Irishmen, i., 121, 156-159, 192, 193, 205; arrest and examination of, i., 121, 193-195; ii., 285; distrusted by other leaders, i., 259-263; claims to be agent of United Irishmen to France, ii., 270, 272, 273, 277-280, 283, 285-287, 294, 299
- O'Connor, Charles, i., 17
- O'Connor, Dermot, i., 21
- O'Connor, Roger, ii., 260
- O'Connor, T. P., list of Coercion Acts compiled by, i., 274; on brutal treatment of Irish prisoners, i., 284; on Governmental relief in famine, i., 301, 304-307; on Irish emigration, i., 316-320; on separate fiscal system intended for Ireland, ii., 66, 67; on jury-packing, ii., 218, 220
- Octavianus, the anti-pope, i., 53
- O'Donovan, Dr. John, on Irish annals, i., 18-21; on persecution of the Catholics, i., 65, 68, 69
- O'Flaverty, —, i., 17
- O'Hanlon, Very Rev. John, Canon of Dublin, on Pitt, i., 232-234
- O'Hart, John, on Gaelic language, i., 16, 17; on Brehon laws, i., 22, 23; on Irish MSS., i., 36
- O'Kelly, James, on Unity and Home Rule for Ireland, ii., 152
- O'Leary, Rev. Arthur, reply of, to Wesley, i., 115
- O'Mahoney, Col. John, letter of, ii., 115; Mitchell's letter to, ii., 246, 247
- O'Neil, Felin Bacach, i., 65
- O'Neil, Hugh Boy, i., 65
- O'Neil, Shane, attempted murder of, i., 65, 66
- O'Neill, Donald, King of Ulster, i., 61
- O'Neill, Sir Brian, murder of, i., 65, 66, 69
- Orange, William of, at battle of the Boyne, i., 110, 177; Irish landowners dispossessed by, i., 197; ii., 139; *see* William.
- Orange Association, the, origin of, i., 146, 184-187; rules and regulations of, i., 184, 185; oath of extermination administered to members of, i., 194, 195
- Orange Free State, the, ii., 77
- Orange yeomanry, the, quartered on the people, i., 159, 209, 224; ii., 165
- Orangemen, the, organization of, i., 146, 184-187; bigotry and intolerance of, i., 114, 123, 127, 165, 166, 176, 177, 193, 322; ii., 73, 222; atrocities committed by, i., 152, 161, 165-167, 176-181, 183, 185, 186, 196-200, 208-210; ii., 75, 165; protected and subsidized by British Government, i., 161, 163, 164, 167, 183, 207, 215, 238, 261, 262, 286; ii., 222; Peep-o'-day boys change name to, i., 165, 167; licentiousness of, i., 167, 294, 295, 303; celebration of battle of the Boyne by, i., 177, 331; not good fighters, i., 178, 200, 201; nominally Protestant, i., 184, 186, 187; political power of, i., 187, 280, 282
- Orland, fight at, i., 200
- Ormond, Marquis of, brutality of troops of, i., 67, 68, 87; on false witnesses, i., 86; on butchery of Drogheda, i., 93; suit against, i., 172
- O'Reilly, John Boyle, cited, ii., 47
- O'Rourke, Rev. J., on Irish famines, i., 301, 307
- Outdoor Relief Act, the, i., 298
- Oxford, University of, founding of the, i., 31, 43

P

- Paisley, ii., 244
- Pale, the, English jurisdiction confined to limits of, i., 60; ii., 85, 205, 206
- Papars, Cardinal, i., 57
- Paper mills of Ireland, ii., 25
- Pall Mall Gazette*, the, i., 294, 295, 303
- Palmerston, Lord, attempts to grant charter to a Catholic university, ii., 77
- Paris, Irish MSS. in, i., 36; the Emmets in, i., 259, 264; ii., 259, 266, *et seq.*; emigration of Irish glove-makers to, ii., 25
- Parliament, British, concedes independence of Irish Parliament, i., 119, 158, 248, 249; duration of, i., 120; acts of, for Catholic relief, i., 138, 139; jury-packing sanctioned by, i., 174; proportion of Irish Catholics and Protestants returned to, i., 175, 176; bribery and corruption of, i., 225, 226, 232, 239, 244, 245; ii., 190; Ireland governed by special legislation of, i., 252; ii., 105, 163; Irish representation in, i., 254, 255; ii., 38, 66, 71, 178, 180; policy of Irish members in Imperial, i., 254, 255; ii., 70, 71, 111, 177, 189, 234-238; Coercion Acts of, i., 272-276; ii., 104, 105; Local Government Bill passed by, i., 281, 282; land legislation of, the cause of Irish famine, i., 305; land acts passed by, ii., 91, 103, 113, 148, 150, 156-158, 179; restrictive enactments of, ii., 3, 10, 19, 27; *see also under* Ireland and British Government; act of, relating to Irish debt, ii., 33; discussion in, on Irish taxation, ii., 56, 111; refused to grant university to Irish Catholics, ii., 73; action of, in Scotch Crofter's troubles, ii., 154
- Parliament, Irish, independence of, gained, i., 119, 158, 248, 249; ii., 21, 227; duration of Irish, i., 121; act of, establishing liberty of conscience, i., 115; Catholics excluded from, i., 120, 139, 247, 252; Catholic relief bills introduced into, i., 145, 150; Supply Bill passed by, i., 150; Union gained by bribery of, i., 206, 212, 213, 216, 225-233, 236, 244; a puppet of British Government, i., 216, 247; ii., 5, 6; Miss Emmet's appeal to, i., 217-219, 221, 223; Bill for Union rejected by, i., 224, 233; Union accepted by, i., 222, 228-233; legislative power of, questioned, i., 247-249; debate in, on silk manufactures, ii., 12, 25; agreement between British Parliament and, ii., 27; protests against system of taxation, ii., 58, 64; agrarian laws enacted by, ii., 88, 89; "Ulster tenant rights" originated in, ii., 127; hope for a future, ii., 159, 162, 170, 171
- "Parliament of the Pale," ii., 6, 7
- Parliamentary Commission, *see* Royal.
- Parliamentary Committee, members of the Irish Directory before, i., 199, 205
- Parliamentary reform for Ireland, efforts to obtain, i., 130-135
- Parnell, Charles Stewart, libel suit of, i., 10; efforts of, in behalf of Home Rule, ii., 95, 141, 155, 180
- Parnell's Bill, i., 292
- Parsons, Sir Laurence, i., 17
- Parsons, Sir William, i., 86; ii., 197-199, 202
- Patrick Street, *see* Dublin.
- Pauperism in Ireland, i., 302, 303; ii., 10, 50, 51, 61
- Peace establishment in Ireland, i., 242
- "Peace Preservation Act for Ireland," i., 272
- Peel, Sir Robert, i., 280; ii., 97, 115
- Peep-o'-day boys, the, i., 165, 167
- Peers and Peerages, *see* Irish.
- Pelagius, the Heresiarch, i., 20
- Pelham, —, English commander, i., 66, 67
- Penal Code of Ireland, i., 111, 113, 136-141; ii., 82, 96; additions to, by William III., i., 138; ii., 80, 81; needed reform in, i., 135, 136; attempts to obtain repeal of, i., 122, 136, 138, 139, 145; ii., 50; modification of, i., 138-140; object of, ii., 93; *see also* Ireland.
- Penn, William, i., 71, 115
- Percie, Sir Richard, troops of, i., 67
- Perrot, Sir John, plan of, to exterminate Irish Catholics, i., 314, 315
- Persecutions, *see under* Catholics.
- Petitions, for religious freedom, i., 122, 141, 144; against the Union, i., 224, 245, 248

- Petty, Sir William, on war of extermination, i., 100, 101; suit of, against Ormond, i., 172; the Union proposed by, i., 236; on iron industries of Ireland, ii., 13
- Philadelphia, i., 321
- Philipstown, i., 63
- Phœnicians, the, relations of, with Ireland, i., 17, 27
- Picts, the, i., 35
- Piedmont, monastery in, founded by Columbanus, i., 36
- Pilot*, the Boston, ii., 181
- Pinkerton, John, on list of Irish kings, i., 18
- Pitch-cap, the, method of torture practised on Irish, i., 179, 181, 182, 196, 201
- Pitt, William, the Younger, i., 6, 109; duplicity of, i., 143, 144, 147-151, 154; the demon of discord, i., 153; incites Irish rebellion, i., 168, 177, 195, 196, 207, 219, 223, 225, 229, 260; ii., 39, 40; compared with Strafford, i., 226; machinations of, i., 232, 237, 246; his system of bribery, i., 231, 232, 239; ii., 34, 35, 39; on advantages of the Union, i., 241; effect of his measures on Ireland, i., 220-221; ii., 28; on policy of British Government, ii., 30
- Place Bill, the, i., 225
- Placemen, i., 121, 240, 244, 248
- "Plantations" in Ireland, *see* Ulster, Munster, and Connaught.
- Plowden, Francis, on misrepresentation of Irish history, i., 3, 4; persecution of, i., 6; unhappy condition of Ireland, i., 61; unfairness of, as historian, i., 81, 82; on Irish goaded into rebellion, i., 87; on Irish outrages, i., 148-153, 167, 192, 196; reliability of, as historian, i., 162-164; on the Union, i., 238, 239; ii., 37; criticism of Davis, i., 253; on Irish commerce, ii., 10, 11
- Plunket, Lord, on illegality of Union, i., 250, 251
- Plunket, David, eulogy on Ulster, i., 293
- Plunket, Horace, on Irish Nationalists, ii., 179
- Plymley, Peter, i., 6
- Poems, Irish, i., 40-42, 230, 231
- Poictou, i., 278
- Poland, Russian tyranny in, ii., 5, 172, 218
- Poles, the, condition of, compared with that of Irish, i., 136
- Police, Irish, *see* Constabulary.
- Pollimus, i., 57
- Polychronicon*, the, ii., 3
- Poor Laws in Ireland, ii., 50, 134, 247
- "Popery Laws," the, i., 139, 148, 165; ii., 215
- "Pope's Pedlars," the, i., 89
- Population of England, ii., 34, 49, 50, 235, 236
- Population of Ireland, i., 108, 137, 297, 298, 320, 321; ii., 38, 45, 49-52, 56, 57, 62, 171, 185, 235; at time of invasion, i., 108; in 1841-1851, i., 297, 298; compared with that of Scotland, i., 320, 321; in 1801, ii., 38; decrease of, i., 306, 307, 319, 320; ii., 28, 34, 40, 42, 44, 51, 56, 57, 67, 70, 87, 161, 166, 179
- Population of Scotland, i., 320, 321; ii., 45
- Portland, Duke of, i., 147-149
- Portugal, ii., 9
- Postlethwayt, Malachy, on advantages of the Union, i., 236, 237; ii., 164
- Post-office of Ireland, the, i., 329
- Potato crop, the, i., 297; failure of, i., 298, 300; ii., 245; chief article of food in Ireland, ii., 5, 88, 92, 102, 106, 107, 164
- Powell, Mr., horrible death of, i., 182
- Poyning, Sir Edward, ii., 7
- "Poyning's Law," i., 118; ii., 7, 100, 210
- Prague, Irish college at, i., 93
- Prendergast, John P., on Act of Oblivion, etc., i., 88-90; on Connaught Plantations, i., 102-104
- Presbyterian ministers, grant to, ii., 65
- Presbyterians or Dissenters of Ireland, distinct from Protestants, i., 122, 125, 128-131, 140, 141, 143, 151, 165; petition of, for Catholic relief, i., 141; proportion of, appointed to Irish offices, i., 324; university of, at Belfast, ii., 74, 75; numerical strength of, ii., 75
- Presbyterians of Ulster, the, i., 122-126, 128, 288; ii., 214; emigration of, ii., 87

Press, the, i., 6, 9, 10, 165, 267, 280, 287, 300, 318-321; ii., 46, 47, 67, 68, 74, 142, 218
 Press Gang, the, i., 140, 162
 Primrose League, the, i., 329
 Prison-ships, horrors of English, i., 209; ii., 225
 Proprietary rights in Ireland, ii., 124, 125, 130, 131, 135, 137
 Protective tariff, effect of, in England and Ireland, i., 282, 283; ii., 106, 107
 "Protestant Ascendancy" in Ireland, the, i., 130, 142, 143, 146, 148, 183-185, 206, 295, 323
 Protestant schools, Catholics taxed for maintenance of, ii., 76-78
 Protestant succession, the, i., 165; ii., 222
 Protestants, the designation of Irish Members of Established Church, i., 120, 122, 129-131, 151, 160, 161; belong to National Party, i., 233, 238, 281; Dissenters jealous of, i., 326-328; proportion of, in Ireland, i., 186, 187, 286-295, 325; ii., 75; proportion of, appointed to office, i., 328-332; intolerant spirit of, i., 123, 130-134, 145, 146, 323, 331, 332; ii., 75, 77, 82, 83, 222
 Protestantism, Anglo-Ulster, bigotry of, ii., 77, 82
 Provinces, Irish, the, comparative conditions in, i., 287-295
 Puffendorff, cited, i., 250

Q

Quaker meetings established in Ireland, i., 115
 Quarantine Hospital, the, at Staten Island, i., 308
 Queen's College, i., 325
 Queens, County of, ii., 78; criminal record of, ii., 187, 188
 Queenstown, opening of, ii., 72

R

Rape and robbery, sufferings of Irish from, i., 192, 196, 197, 201, 204
 Rathmore, massacre of Mulloghmasston on the, i., 64
 Real Biblioteca Borbonica, *see* Naples.
 Rebellion of 1803, the, i., vi.; of 1641, i., 71-77, 81-86, 88, 114
 Rebellion of 1798, incited by British

VOL. II.—23.

Government to bring about the Union, i., 112, 114, 122, 155-157, 168, 169, 177, 190, 192-199, 200, 207, 263; ii., 23, 39, 215; crushed, i., 203-206; examination of leaders of, i., 205; great loss of life in, i., 206-209; ii., 236, 237; begun after arrest of leaders, i., 224; expense of, added to Irish public debt, ii., 39, 58
 Recess Committee of Ireland, ii., 148, 149
 Redmond, John E., on reign of Queen Victoria, ii., 71; at Nationalist Convention, ii., 180; prophecy of, in regard to Ireland, ii., 182
 Reed, Sir Edward James, ii., 218
 Reeves, William, on early culture of Ireland, i., 34, 35
 Reform Acts passed, i., 250, 252
 Reform Measures in Ireland, need of, i., 117-119, 122, 130-135, 138, 144, 147-151
 Registrar-General of Ireland, reports of, i., 293, 303
 Reid, James Seaton, cites Stewart, ii., 214, 215
 Relief Bills for Irish Catholics, i., 136, 138, 139, 145; ii., 50, 93
 Religious animosities in Ireland, *see* British Government.
 Remonstrance, of Irish chiefs addressed to Pope John, i., 61; ii., 190-194; of Irish Catholics to Charles I., i., 78, 90; ii., 195-210
 Renaissance, Irish, the, i., 30
 Rent Redemption Act, the, passed, ii., 157
 Rents, in Ireland, exorbitant, ii., 23, 24, 93, 104, 108, 124, 127, 132-134, 136-138, 141, 148, 149, 164, 189, 235, 238; rack-, i., 305; ii., 140; emigrants aid in payment of, i., 321, 322; ii., 103, 108; yearly tax of, ii., 102; desirability of fixed, ii., 124, 127, 149, 150, 153, 156, 157; Judicial, ii., 156, 157
 Reynolds, Thomas, "the Informer," i., 122, 158, 192
 Richard of Chepstow, i., 50
 Rigg, T. Galloway, on condition of Ulster, i., 289
 Ripon, ii., 76
 Robertson, Rev. T. B., ii., 223
 Robespierre, i., 207
 Rock, Captain, on English prejudice against Ireland, i., 4
 Roden, Lord, *see* Jocelyn.

- Roman Empire, the, influence of, i., 31, 33
 Rome, Irish MSS. in, i., 36; devotion of Irish to See of, i., 331
 Roo, P. de, *History of America before Columbus*, cited, i., 28
 Rooth, Patrick, i., 89
 Roscommon, County of, moral conditions in, i., 294; cattle raising in, ii., 78; criminal record of, ii., 187
 Rosebery, Lord, on importance of Ireland, ii., 179
 Ross, i., 67
 Ross, Judge, ii., 150
 Rossmore, ii., 146
 Rowen, —, leader of United Irishmen, i., 146
 Royal Commission on Financial Relations of Ireland and England, ii., 40-43, 49, 53, 55-57, 59, 60, 63-65, 110, 111, 159; on Labor, ii., 243, 244
 Royal Irish Academy, Irish MSS. in library of, i., 36
 Royal Library, *see* Copenhagen.
 Russell, Lord John, measure of, for relief of famine sufferers, i., 300; on eviction, ii., 97
 Russell, T. W., advocate of United Irish League, i., 292; on over taxation of Ireland, ii., 65; the farmer's friend, ii., 95; on Home Rule, ii., 155; on the Land Question, ii., 155-160; on jury-packing, ii., 218
 Russia, i., 297, tyranny of, in Poland, ii., 5, 172, 218
 Rutledge, Governor John, on outrages by English troops, i., 210, 214, 225, 226
 Rylands, Peter, returns of income tax assessments, i., 289
 Rymer, —, on woollen manufactures of Ireland, ii., 2
- S
- Sagas, the, America mentioned in, i., 40
 St. Augustine, i., 31, 43
 St. Bernard, i., 57
 St. Catherine's Church, Dublin, i., 271
 St. Chrysostom, i., 20
 St. Domingo expedition, ii., 284
 St. Jerome on Irish race, i., 20, 21
 St. Leger, Sir William, letter of, i., 78; cruelty of, in Munster, i., 87
 St. Patrick, Christianity established in Ireland by, i., 20, 26, 28, 236; ii., 191
 St. Senanus, i., 39
 Salisbury, John of, Bishop of Chartres, i., 48, 57
 Salisbury, Lord, i., 176; ii., 91, 157
 Salmon fishery in Ireland, ii., 15
 Sampson, William, on travesty of justice in Ireland, i., 164, 165; on Irish "reign of terror," i., 178-180, 199, 201, 202; ii., 220, 221; escapes arrest, i., 192
 Sanderson, Colonel, ii., 180
 Sardou, Victorien, satirical play of, i., 320
Saturday Review, the, i., 319
 Saurin, Mr., on the Union, i., 217, 251
 Scotch Crofters' troubles, settlement of, ii., 154
 Scotch-Irish, the, emigration of, i., 103, 124, 125; ii., 11, 79, 87; origin of, i., 123, 124, 126; ii., 213-215
 Scotch Fencibles, the, i., 173
 Scotia, name of Ireland for many centuries, i., 34, 35
 Scotland, concessions of England to, i., 138; Union of, with England, i., 213, 236; prosperity of, i., 313, 315; ii., 12, 61, 64, 178, 179; population of, i., 320, 321; ii., 45; agriculture in, ii., 214; consumption of spirits and malt liquors in, ii., 43; constabulary force of, ii., 45, 46; crime in, ii., 45, 46, 183; wages in, ii., 108; John Knox in, ii., 214
 Scully, —, on treaty of Limerick, i., 112, 113
 Scurvy, *see* Diseases.
 Seal, Great, of England, i., 110, 113
 Seanchus Mór, glosses on the, i., 27
 Secret Service fund, record of, i., 190
 Seisereach, or Seistreach, i., 99
 Sellick, David, i., 103
 Serfdom in Ireland, ii., 116-118, 120, 128, 130-135
 Serges, Irish, ii., 2, 3
 Sexton, Sir Charles, on over taxation of Ireland, ii., 29, 41; letter of Wellington to, ii., 190
 Shannon, Lord, bribery of, i., 226
 Shannon, the, i., 97, 99
 Shea, Denis, ill-treatment and death of, ii., 247, 248
 Sheffield, Lord, on Irish exports, ii., 9, 26, 27

- Ship-building industry of Ireland, ii., 1, 12, 14
 Ship-fever, *see* Diseases.
 Silk fabrics of Ireland, excellence of, ii., 25
 Silk manufactures of Ireland, ii., 12, 13, 18, 25, 79
 Silver work of Ireland, ii., 1
 Sirr, Major, "Battalion of Testimony" drilled by, i., 189, 267
 Skibbereen, i., 316
 Skryne, i., 101
 Sligo, County of, moral conditions in, i., 294; white gloves presented to judges in, ii., 184, 185
 Smallpox, *see* Diseases.
 Smeerewecke, i., 66
 Smith, Adam, on commercial restrictions of Ireland, ii., 19; on potatoes, ii., 88
 Smith, Joseph, on Scotch-Irish, ii., 213-215
 Smith, Sydney, i., 6; on concessions to Ireland, ii., 100, 101
 Smuggling in Ireland, cause of, ii., 7, 8
 Soap and candle manufactures of Ireland, ii., 19, 26, 79
 South Africa, i., 210; ii., 45
 South Carolina, Rutledge's speech to Legislature of, i., 210, 214
 South Tyrone, ii., 155
 Spain, intercourse between Ireland and, ii., 1, 191
 Spencer, Herbert, on property in land, ii., 92; on Irish linen manufactures, ii., 27
 Spenser, Edmund, on condition of Ireland, i., 10, 11; on Irish nation, i., 27; on condition of Munster, i., 66, 67
 Spies, Government, duties of, i., 188-192, 194, 206
 Spirits and beer, tax on Irish, ii., 18, 41, 42
 Sports in Ireland, i., 37
 Stanton's Tracts, ii., 23
 Staten Island, i., 308
 Statute of Kilkenny, ii., 6
 Staunton, Mr., on the national debt, ii., 36, 37
 Stewart, Rev. Andrew, on Scotch-Irish, ii., 213, 214
 Stewart, Robert, *see* Castlereagh.
 Stockings, duty on Irish, ii., 18, 27
 Stokes, Rev. G. T., cited, i., 35
 Stowe, Irish MSS. in library at, i., 36
 Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, Lord Deputy of Ireland, i., 73, 74; on Irish land question, i., 75; on woollen manufactures, ii., 5; on incitement of religious animosities, ii., 221
 Strang, Rev. William, on piety and learning in Ireland, i., 38-40
 Stuart, James, description of Armagh by, ii., 1-4
 Students flock to Ireland, i., 39; ii., 2
 Subletting Act, the, evils of, ii., 164, 165
 Sugar, importation of, into Ireland, ii., 18, 79
 Sullivan, A. M., on Irish famines, i., 303, 304, 320
 Surnames, Irish, legislation in regard to, i., 101; ii., 211, 212
 Sutherland, Hugh, on Irish harvesters in Great Britain, ii., 240-244
 Sutton, i., 101
 Sweetman, John, leader of United Irishmen, ii., 262; arrest of, i., 192
 Swift, Dean, i., 6; ii., 135; on Irish gentry, i., 104
 Swinford, migratory harvesters from, ii., 245
 Switzerland, i., 264
Sydney Papers, the, cited, i., 96
- T
- Taafe, Dennis, on misrepresentations of Ireland by English historians, i., 13, 14; on persecution of Irish priests, i., 96, 97
 Taafe, Viscount, i., 330
 Tacitus, cited, i., 27; ii., 2
 Talbott, Sir Robert, ii., 210
 Tapestry and carpet industries of Ireland unequalled, ii., 25
 Tara, convention of, i., 29; Roll of, i., 30
 Tax, income, on Ireland made permanent, ii., 60
 Taxation, oppressive system of, in Ireland, i., 131, 140, 297; ii., 17, 32-44, 56, 57, 62, 102, 164, 166; proportionate scale of, of Ireland and England, ii., 39, 40, 52, 53
 Taylor, John F., i., 328-331; on "Down-Trodden Irish Protestants," i., 328-331; ii., 222
 Teeling, Charles Hamilton, on tortures practised on Irish Catholics,

- Teeling, — *Continued.*
i., 182, 196-198; on the rising in Wexford, i., 200
- Temple, —, enmity of, to Irish, ii., 211
- Tenants, Irish, laws affecting landlords and, ii., 89, 90, 156, 158, 163; rights of, ii., 104-106, 108, 116-119, 131-133, 137, 138, 156, 157, 163; primitive claim of, ii., 110, 119, 122
- Tenant's Right of Ulster, ii., 96, 127, 128
- Tennent, —, ii., 260
- Tennyson, Lord, Queen Victoria's correspondence with, ii., 72
- "Testimony, the Battalion of," *see* Battalion.
- Thacher, James, cites Livingston's speech, i., 209
- Thames, trade on the, ii., 59
- Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, i., 57
- The Sham Squire*, reference to Toler in, i., 173
- Thomond, County of, i., 99
- Thurloe, Secretary, i., 103
- Tighernach, on Irish annals, i., 18
- Timber, destruction of Irish, ii., 13, 14
- Times*, the London, i., 10, 287, 288, 291, 303, 317, 318, 320; ii., 43, 91, 98, 151, 179, 243, 247
- Tipperary, County of, massacre of Catholics in, i., 95; cattle raising in, ii., 78; evictions in, ii., 98; criminal record of, ii., 185, 187
- Tithes, oppressive system of, i., 131; ii., 87, 164
- Title to Irish lands, *see* Land.
- Tobacco, direct importation of, into Ireland prohibited, ii., 79
- Toler, Judge, *see* Norbury.
- Tolerance, religious, *see* Catholics.
- Toleration Act, the, i., 125
- Tone, Theobald Wolfe, urges formation of Irish associations, i., 133; on Irish in English Army, ii., 238
- Torture, methods of, invented and practised in Ireland, i., 178-181, 190, 196, 197
- Tory Government unpopular in 1803, i., 259, 283
- Tory party, the, corrupt record of, in government of Ireland, i., 11, 176; embarrassment of, in regard to judicial rents, ii., 156
- Townsend, Colonel, i., 96
- Trade, Irish, proposed increase of, i., 243; pernicious restrictions laid upon, ii., 7, 8, 10-17, 29; destruction of, ii., 29, 59, 142
- Transit rates and facilities of Ireland, ii., 64
- Transvaal, the, ii., 70, 77, 148
- Treaty obligations, England's disregard of, i., 212-214
- Treaty between United Irishmen and Anglo-Irish Government, i., 168
- Treaty of Limerick, the, i., 110, 111; violation of, i., 112, 113
- Treaty of Windsor, i., 60
- Trevelyan, Sir George, Parliamentary returns of, i., 289-291; on eviction, ii., 97
- Trevor, —, Gaoler of Newgate, i., 271
- Trial by jury, *see* Jury.
- Trim, i., 78, 101; ii., 195; Castle of, i., 109
- Trinity College, Dublin, Irish MSS. in, i., 36; i., 63, 325, 330; ii., 211; Emmet resigns from, i., 259, 264, 269; establishment of, ii., 74; seized by Protestants, ii., 74-76
- Trivet, Nicholas, on Adrian's Bull, i., 48
- Tuam, John, Archbishop of, i., 319, 330
- Tuberculosis among Irish emigrants, i., 308, 309
- Turin, Irish MSS. in University Library of, i., 35
- Turner, Sir James, i., 89
- Turner, Samuel, informer, i., 192
- Tyne, the, ii., 59
- Typhus fever in Ireland, resulting from famine, i., 297, 307, 310, 312; ii., 98
- Tyrconnell, —, confiscation of lands of, i., 71
- Tyrone, —, rebellion of, i., 65, 68, 69; confiscation of lands of, i., 71
- Tyrone, County of, suffering and misery in, i., 68; denominational strength of, i., 288; Nationalists in, i., 289; moral conditions in, i., 293, 294
- U
- Uberti, Fazio Delli, Irish woollen manufactures mentioned by, ii., 2
- Uitlanders, the, ii., 148
- Ulster, Annals of, i., 19; O'Neill, King of, i., 61; "Plantation" of, by James I., i., 71, 73, 83, 123, 145; ii., 85, 125-129, 213-215;

Ulster,—*Continued.*

proportion of Catholics and Protestants in, i., 121-123, 125-127, 131, 286-289; disturbances in, i., 160, 165; ii., 44; Protestant bigotry of, i., 170, 171, 186, 323, 331; ii., 73, 77, 88; industries of, destroyed, i., 124, 178; ii., 10-12, 79, 87, 102; valuation of ratable property in, i., 290; decrease of population and education in, i., 290; houses and agricultural holdings in, i., 291, 292; moral conditions in, i., 293-295; the "loyalist province," i., 280; income-tax assessment of, i., 289; evictions in, i., 292; emigrations from, i., 124; ii., 10, 11, 87, 88; spread of United Irish League in, ii., 150; Tenant's Right of, ii., 96, 127, 128

"Ulster Grants," the, ii., 88-90, 124

Ulster Junto, the, ii., 80, 81

Ulster Volunteers, the, organization of, i., 114, 117, 118; efforts of, to obtain repeal of Penal laws, i., 122

Union, Legislative, of Great Britain and Ireland, way prepared for, by Rebellion of 1798, i., 122, 153, 168, 177, 191, 200; proposed advantages of, i., 157, 158, 213, 236, 241-244; ii., 22, 31-39, 166; effected through bribery and corruption, i., 160, 216, 225, 226, 230-232, 238, 240, 241, 244, 258, 262; ii., 227-234; *see* Black list; Pitt's great object, i., 168, 177, 219, 232, 237, 238; established, i., 206, 230, 251; ii., 177; opposition to, i., 211-223, 233, 244, 247, 251; ii., 56, 169; petitions against, i., 224, 245, 248; accepted in despair, i., 229, 232, 233; provisions of, i., 220, 252, 254; ii., 33-39, 56, 57, 60, 65, 66; articles of, proclaimed, i., 233; a calamity and curse to Ireland, i., vi., 112, 160, 168, 211-223, 228, 230, 233-237, 241-246, 251-254, 272-275, 305, 306; ii., 13, 23-28, 31-48, 52, 60, 109-111, 162-166, 169; illegality of, i., 247-251

Union Bills, the, result of, i., 216, 224, 227, 232, 245

Union with Scotland, articles of, i., 213, 236

Unionists, proportion of, in Irish County Council elections, i., 280, 282

United Irish League, the, land measure of, i., 292; purpose of, ii., 68, 112, 144, 146; platform of, ii., 147, 150, 151; a Connaught movement, ii., 147, 150; growth of, ii., 150, 151, 180, 187; good effect of, ii., 150-153, 160, 174, 175, 184; principles of, condemned, ii., 153, 155; differs from Land League, ii., 159

United Irishmen, the, organization of, i., 126, 130, 131, 133; constitution of, i., 133; purpose of, i., 133-136, 156, 158, 159, 165, 193, 194, 196, 200; the Directory and leaders of, i., 121, 193, 199, 205, 211, 260-262; arrest and imprisonment of leaders of, i., 129, 157, 159, 160, 199, 205, 211, 212, 220; distrust the Government, i., 146, 157; a Protestant movement, i., 158, 160, 196, 198; nicknames of, i., 181; spies and informers among, i., 188, 191, 260, 262; expect aid from France, i., 193, 197, 269, 270; connection of the Emmets with, i., 270; leaders of, distrust O'Connor, ii., 262

United Irish Societies, suppression of, attempted, i., 196, 197

United States, the, action of, relating to emigrant ships, i., 309, 310; Irish emigration to, ii., 63, 173; contributions from Irish in, to Ireland, i., 321, 322; ii., 103, 108; Constitution of, ii., 162; financial rival of England, ii., 176; Civil War in, ii., 211; population of, ii., 212

Universities, German, i., 30; of Ireland in Middle Ages, i., 28; British Government establishes Protestant, ii., 74, 75, 196

University of Dublin, ii., 74, 75, 116

University, Government refuses, to Irish Catholics, ii., 73-75, 77, 82, 83, 196

University Library, *see* Turin.

Uppington, Sir John, i., 331

Urquhart, Rev. John, on evictions, ii., 96

Usher, Archbishop, on Irish famine, i., 67

V

Vallancey, —, antiquarian, i., 17

Vassalage, in Ireland, *see* Serfdom.

Vatican Library, the, i., 27

Verdicts, Irish, *see* Convictions.

- Vereker, Mr., i., 217
 Vernon, Captain John, i., 103
 Victoria, Queen, reign of, i., 279, 284;
 ii., 71, 72; Jubilee of, ii., 71, 73,
 179, 184; correspondence of, with
 Tennyson, ii., 72; opposed to
 Home Rule, ii., 72; agrarian agi-
 tation in reign of, ii., 93-95
 Villaneuva, i., 17
 Virginia, Irish Catholic children sent
 to, i., 101
 Volunteer Movement, the, purpose
 of, i., 114, 117-119; ii., 21; con-
 ventions, i., 118, 130, 145; *see also*
 Ulster Volunteers.
 Votes for the Union obtained by brib-
 ery, *see* Union.
- W
- Wages in Ireland, scale of, ii., 106-
 108, 132, 243; in Scotland, ii., 108;
 in Wales, ii., 108
 Wakefield, Edward, on wages in Ire-
 land, ii., 132, 133
 Wales, Irish missionaries in, i., 31;
 Protective tariff in, ii., 12; scale of
 wages in, ii., 108; enjoys local gov-
 ernment, ii., 178, 179
 Walker, Judge, *see* Assizes.
 Wall, Colonel, i., 92
 Walsh, John, ii., 210
 Walsingham, Sir Francis, ii., 93
 Ward's Island, Emigrant Refuge Hos-
 pital on, i., 308
 Warner, Ferdinando, on extirpation
 of Irish Catholics, i., 76, 77; on
 massacre of Isle Magee, i., 82, 83;
 on Cromwell's Irish campaign, i.,
 92, 93, 95
 Warwick, Earl of, i., 87
 Washington, Colonel, possible ances-
 tor of George Washington, i., 71,
 88
 Waterford, County of, proportion of
 Catholics in, i., 8, 198; petitions
 against Union, i., 224; criminal
 record of, ii., 184, 185
 Webb, Judge, on University of Dub-
 lin, ii., 74, 75
 Webb, William, on destruction of
 Irish MSS., i., 36
 Welby, Lord, on taxation of Ireland,
 ii., 53, 63
 "We'll kick the Pope before us,"
 Orange ballad, i., 331
 Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke
 of, opposed to Catholic emancipa-
 tion, i., 138, 139, 280; letter of, to
 Sir Charles Sexton, ii., 190
 Wentworth, Thomas, *see* Strafford.
 Wesley, and Rev. Arthur O'Leary,
 i., 115
 West Indies, the, i., 101-103; ii., 9
 Westmeath, County of, King James's
 grants in, ii., 128; criminal record
 of, ii., 187, 188
 Westminster Abbey, i., 38
 Westminster Cabinet, i., 329; ii., 6
Westminster Gazette, the, article on
 "The Basis of Consent," ii., 177-
 179
 Westminster, Mathew of, i., 49
 Westmonasteriensis, cited, i., 54
 Weston-super-Mare, ii., 96
 Westport, migratory harvesters from,
 ii., 245
 Wexford, ii., 71
 Wexford, County of, Cromwell's
 treatment of, i., 93; greatest mili-
 tary atrocities committed in, i.,
 159, 160, 196, 198, 199; ii., 223,
 224; proportion of Catholics in,
 i., 198; the uprising of, i., 200, 224
 Whaley, Mr., i., 217
 Wheat crop, failure of, in Russia, i.,
 297
 Whiskey, industry of Ireland, ii., 5,
 12; use of, in Ireland, ii., 7, 43,
 61, 63
 Wicklow, County of, military execu-
 tions in, i., 199; ii., 205; manufac-
 tures of, ii., 26, 28; King James's
 grants in, ii., 128
 William the Conqueror, i., 56
 William and Mary, treaty of Limer-
 ick between Irish Catholics and, i.,
 110; violation of treaty by, i., 111-
 113; *see also* William III.
 William (of Orange) III., subjugation
 of Ireland completed by, i., 108-
 110; duplicity of, i., 111; ii., 27;
 enforces Penal Code against Irish
 Catholics, i., 111, 112, 114, 138,
 183; ii., 80, 81, 181; hatred of,
 for Irish, i., 112, 124, 177, 178,
 183; ii., 80, 81
 Williams, —, on *Real Property*,
 cited, ii., 92
 Wilmot, Sir Charles, troops of, i., 67
 Windsor, treaty of, between Henry
 II. and Ireland, i., 60
 Witnesses, false, British Government
 makes use of, in Ireland, i., 84, 85,
 168, 170, 172, 174, 180, 188-190,
 203, 266, 267

Wolffe, —, *see* Kilwarden.

Woodrow MSS. in Edinburgh, ii., 214

Wool, quality of Irish, ii., 9

Woollen industries of Ireland, destruction of, i., 124, 125, 178, 213; ii., 1-3, 10, 18, 25, 26, 79, 87, 102, 135, 214

Wright, Judge, *see* Assizes.

Writs, i., 239; ii., 94, 137, 149

Wyndham, —, Chief Secretary of Ireland, on religious persuasion of Irish office-holders, i., 332

Y

Yorktown, Cornwallis at, i., 201

Youghall, spread of Quakerism in, i., 115

Young, Arthur, on fertility of Ireland, i., 321; on Irish landlords, ii., 131, 132

Young Ireland party, the, ii., 137

Z

Zimmer, Heinrich, on Ireland as a seat of learning, i., 31-36



3 9031 01276413 0

205883

Boston College Library

Chestnut Hill 67, Mass.

Books are kept for two weeks unless a shorter time is specified.

Two cents a day is charged for each 2-week book kept overtime; 25 cents a day for each overnight book.

If you cannot find what you want, inquire at the delivery desk for assistance.



11-46

